

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE GRADUATE ASSISTANT
SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMME AT TECHNIKON NATAL AS A
STAFF DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM.

by

ROSLYN HAVENGA

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTERS IN EDUCATION (TERTIARY EDUCATION)

in the Division of

TERTIARY EDUCATION

at the

UNIVERSITY OF NATAL (DURBAN)

CO-SUPERVISORS

SIOUX M^cKENNA (Natal Technikon)

RUTH SEARLE (University of Natal)

DECEMBER 2000

SUMMARY

This exploratory case study investigated the Graduate Assistant (GA) Scholarship Programme at Technikon Natal (TN) as a staff development mechanism. Although GA programmes are not a new concept and have been used internationally for decades as a means to develop academic staff, the programme at TN has some differences. This programme was initiated to address the development of young Black, and in the main African, academics in order to assist with meeting future employment equity requirements. The programme in its simplest form offers the GA the opportunity to gain teaching experience while studying for a post graduate qualification. Between 1995 and 2000, fifty GAs were involved in the programme at TN, with the majority of GAs studying at the BTech qualification level.

This case study identified the juxtaposition of two perspectives of influence, those of the institutional and the individual issues. The institutional issues identified were categorised into policy and procedural issues and the individual issues focused on staff development and mentorship issues. Although the findings cannot be generalised, significant issues have been identified which could prove of value to a wider audience.

In addition to developing Black academics, the programme makes a significant contribution to increasing the achievement of higher qualifications from the technikon sector. This is desirable in order to produce the technological foundation for South Africa's future economy.

The study identified great potential in the GAs and in the community at TN who have embraced this opportunity to develop young academics of the future. Although there are a number of issues to be addressed, the key stakeholders of this study; the GAs and their Heads of Departments, are well supported by the management and relevant units at TN.

DECLARATION

I declare that the whole dissertation entitled:

A Critical Examination of the Graduate Assistant Scholarship Programme
at Technikon Natal as a Staff Development Mechanism

is my own original work and that all the sources I have used or quoted in
the text have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete
references.

Roslyn Havenga
December 2000

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	7
List of tables	8
Definition of terms	8
CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING	9
Statement of the Problem	9
Research Questions	9
The Problem and its Setting	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Relevance of Study	11
CHAPTER 2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	12
Introduction	12
2.1 INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES - POLICY and PROCEDURE	12
2.2 INDIVIDUAL ISSUES - STAFF DEVELOPMENT and MENTORSHIP	24
Multiple Roles of GAs	24
Teaching Programmes	24
Staff Development at TN	26
Trends in Staff Development	27
Mentoring	29
Completion of Qualification	30
GA unionisation	30
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY and METHODS	33
The Data	34
The Samples	35
Issues of Reliability and Validity	36
CHAPTER 4 INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	38
Introduction	38
4.1 INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES - POLICY and PROCEDURE	38
4.1.1 POLICY	38
Vision and Goals	38
Issues of Culture, Race and Gender	39
Spread of GA allocation at TN.	41

Comparison between Technologies and Humanities	42
Types of Graduate Assistants	44
Funding	45
4.1.2 PROCEDURE	46
Contracts and Written Agreements	46
Comparison of Policy and Contracts relating to the GA scholarship at TN	46
Remuneration and Fee Waiver	48
Job Descriptions	49
Duties and Workloads	50
Level and Type of Lecturing	52
Recruitment and Admission Criteria	54
Academic Literacy and Language	55
Handbooks	56
4.2 INDIVIDUAL ISSUES - STAFF DEVELOPMENT and MENTORSHIP	57
4.2.1 STAFF DEVELOPMENT	57
Introduction	57
Orientation	57
Teaching Induction	58
Teaching Portfolios	59
Quality Assurance	59
Teaching Methods and Assessment	59
Understanding of Outcomes Based Education	59
Evaluation and Feedback	61
Appraisal	63
Rewards and Problems	64
Teaching Outcomes	64
Additional Staff Development Needs	65
Facilities	67
Library Resources	68
4.2.2 MENTORSHIP	69
Introduction	69
Mentorship of the GA at Technikon Natal	70
Issues Affecting Mentoring	71
Development Levels of GAs	72
Prior experience with GA	73
GAs Mentoring Undergraduate Students	73
Departmental Relationships	74
Issues of Communication	75
Tenured / Permanent posts at completion	76

CHAPTER 5 - CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATIONS	79
5.1 CONCLUSION	79
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	80
REFERENCES	83
ANNEXURES	87
Annexure 1 Questionnaire for Graduate Assistants	88
1.1 Covering Letter	
1.2 Questionnaire	
1.3 Responses to Questionnaire	
Annexure 2 Questionnaire for HODs with Current Graduate Assistants	117
2.1 Covering Letter	
2.2 Questionnaire	
2.3 Responses to Questionnaire	
Annexure 3 Mini Questionnaire - Opinions on the GA programme at TN	137
3.1 Covering Letter	
3.2 Questionnaire	
3.3 Responses to Mini Questionnaire	
Annexure 4 Questionnaire for Past GAs employed by TN	141
4.1 Covering Letter	
4.2 Questionnaire	
4.3 Responses to Questionnaire	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer acknowledges with gratitude the assistance and encouragement of numerous persons during the course of preparation for this study. They include particularly the supervisors of this study, Ruth Searle of the University of Natal and Sioux M°Kenna of Technikon Natal; Anushi Moonasar, Librarian, Technikon Natal; the management, HODs and graduate assistants of Technikon Natal who shared their perceptions so candidly; and the academic and personal support from colleagues and family.

To AYANDA

My Mentee, My Muse.

LIST OF TABLES

Table No 1	- Relationship of Affirmative Action Base, Tasks and Employment Equity Goals	15
Table No 2	- Comparison of Perceived Workloads by HODs and GAs	50
Table No 3	- Percentage of Time Allocated to Tasks - Comparison HOD and GA Perceptions	53
Table No 4	- Comparison HOD and GA Perception of Evaluation and Feedback	61
Table No 5	- Perceived Competency in Meeting the Outcomes for the Teaching Portfolio	65

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Management	This term is used to describe the management structure of Technikon Natal including the Principal, Vice Principal - Academic and Deans
Support units	The Human Resources (HR) Department and Academic Quality Unit (AQU) were included in the mini-questionnaire. The Counselling Unit and possibly some other units could be included in future developments.
GAs	Graduate Assistants...(includes international references to Teaching Assistants, Research Assistants, Administrative Graduate Assistants)
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
HODs	Heads of Departments
SET	Science, Engineering and Technology
TN	Technikon Natal
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
NUTESA	National Union of Technikon Employees of South Africa
NEHAWU	National Education, Health and Allied Workers Union
SRC	Students Representative Council
Learnership	Tri-party education and training initiative combining the learner, the employer and the provider.

CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Statement of the Problem

A Critical Examination of the Graduate Assistant Scholarship Programme at Technikon Natal as a Staff Development Mechanism.

Research Questions

The overall questions that guide the research are as follows:

- 1 What do GAs understand about the programme and what is required in order to increase their chances of success?
- 2 What expectations, constraints and opportunities face the host department in relation to the GA?
- 3 Does Technikon Management believe the GA programme has done what it was supposed to do, in terms of cost effectiveness and other issues?
- 4 What changes could be implemented to improve the concept?

The Problem and its Setting

The focus of this exploratory case study is to investigate the use of the Graduate Assistant (GA) Scholarship programme at Technikon Natal (TN) as a staff development mechanism. Although GA programmes are not a new concept and have been used internationally for decades as a means to develop academic staff, the programme at TN has some differences. The concept at TN was initiated by the Vice Principal Academic as an attempt to address the development of young Black, and in the main African, academics in order to assist with meeting future employment equity requirements.

The study of the GA programme at TN identifies the juxtaposition of two perspectives of influence, those of institutional issues and individual issues. While the programme is directed and affected by the institutional perspective, the individual perspective in turn affects the strategies adopted by the institution. The institutional issues include the South African society, the economy, recent general legislation, the Higher Education Act and restructuring programme, South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) and the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). Other issues affecting the GA programme include the need for quality, a lifelong learning concept, the impact of technology, internationalisation and changes taking place amongst learners in higher education. These issues impact on the background from where the individual GA will emerge and the future for which the GA will need to be prepared.

The GA concept at TN originated approximately six years ago and developments since then have indicated that the GA programme is perceived to be of value to the Technikon. The concept was established to "...create an environment so that the potential of students from disadvantaged backgrounds could be developed" (Contract, 1999: 1). It is in line with the institution's Employment Equity Policy (1997: 10) which states that TN will implement "...the creation of training opportunities to promote career advancement and broaden equality of opportunity" and that corrective measures to promote representativeness shall include "...new staff development programmes...in the academic and research fields" (Ibid: 18). This policy supports the national requirements for redress and equity outlined in the Employment Equity Act.

The GA programme, in its simplest form, offers the GA the opportunity to gain teaching experience while studying for a postgraduate qualification. Since 1995 twenty eight GAs have completed the programme and at the time of this research in 2000, twenty two others were contracted as GAs. Of the twenty eight past GAs, five were appointed to various lecturing positions at TN. Since the first completed graduate assistantship in 1997, TN assisted twenty three postgraduate students to enter the workplace after receiving a grounding in educational development.

Although as an exploratory case study the findings of this research cannot be generalised, significant issues have been identified which could prove of value to a wider audience. A successful GA programme, apart from the value for TN, could have value as a future national strategy to assist in redressing staff equity. In addition GAs who, on completion of their contract, could enter industry as trainers, would address the need for more facilitators and assessors to support training initiatives in industry in light of the Skills Development Bill.

Initial studies conducted by the researcher at TN showed a wide range of responses to the implementation of the programme. There are possibly misconceptions between management, support units, academics and GAs regarding both policy and procedural issues of the GA Programme, and unless these issues can be identified and corrected the programme may fail in the long term. This failure will not necessarily be due to the limited value of the programme, but could be caused by poor guidelines and communication. The programme is implemented with different parameters and expectations, with different levels of success, in the participating departments. While some of these differences are due to differences between academic programmes and faculties, others are due to misconceptions.

Although the programme at TN was developed in isolation to international trends, there are striking similarities. Therefore the extensive experiences in the United States of America (USA) relating to GAs, while not specifically addressing affirmation action staff development, are used to provide further background to this study.

Limitations of the Study

This exploratory case study focuses on a qualitative investigation of the GA programme at TN in the second semester of 2000 and institutional and individual issues relating to the programme. Institutional issues are those which drive the policy and procedural aspects of the programme, and individual issues are those supported by staff development and mentoring. The perceptions of the current GAs, and HODs with current GAs, are the main areas of investigation, although limited contributions from academic management, Human Resources Department, the Academic Quality Unit and past GAs who have been appointed as lecturers were sought. Although most GAs had mentors, due to the varied nature of this initiative and because of the responsibility and accountability of the HOD, the HOD was the preferred contact person in the department. Due to this being the first study of this nature many issues were identified for further investigation and possible research. Certain aspects such as inclusion of additional stakeholders (such as other academic staff and students) and quantitative studies (such as the identification of precise numbers of GAs needed) were therefore not part of this study. As an institution, TN is termed an Historically White Institution and although the student body is now predominantly black, the staff complement is still predominantly white and male. The institution provides technological education in the higher education band of the NQF.

Relevance of Study

The most important factor which will affect the development of the GA programme at TN is the recent investigation into the restructuring of higher education at national level. The outcome of this investigation will determine the direction that TN should take when specifically addressing the vision for the future of the GA programme and this in turn will affect the design of the programme. The restructuring will mean that all institutions need to "...develop institutional missions and strategic planning in alignment with institutional mandates" (Shape and Size Task Team, 2000). The restructuring of higher education especially in KwaZulu Natal, and with reference to the proposed merger of TN and ML Sultan Technikon, needs to be considered in terms of both the extent of the restructuring and the time frame which will be allocated to implement the changes. The point of departure for institutional missions and the relevant strategic planning will be the institutional mandate which would presumably be negotiated with the Minister of Education.

Part of the strategic plans will be the need to address staff equity. While the GA programme should feature prominently in these plans at TN, cognisance must be taken of the Shape and Size Task Team (2000) who cautioned against changes which "...occur mainly as individualised initiatives by institutions, frequently with no or little reference to real socio-economic and educational needs and to the programme offerings of neighbouring institutions". The GA programme at TN should therefore be studied by a wider audience who will need to judge its worth, particularly those institutions earmarked for restructuring in KwaZulu Natal. Research on the programme could provide the background to further study.

Debates around the viability of Higher Education continue, but for a technikon in South Africa the requirement to supply the country with people with technical skills that can assist this country to build the economy must remain the vision. This must be seen in light of the dwindling applications, less prepared students, effect of HIV/AIDS, lack of funds and the Labour, Equity and Skills Development laws of the country.

The GA programme could have future relevance as a high level learnership. The combination of work experience while gaining a qualification over a specified period of time is similar to that proposed by the Skills Development Act regarding learnerships, although a complication arises in that the Technikon becomes both the employer and the provider.

Using the terminology from SAQA and Outcomes Based Education the purpose for the GA programme must be clearly discussed and communicated, the desired outcomes must be stated and assessment criteria need to be established before we look at further development regarding the contents of the programme. With the sound base developed through past and current experiences, and the enthusiasm and support displayed by the stakeholders at Technikon Natal, the future of the programme presents an opportunity for ensuring the future of academia in South Africa.

CHAPTER 2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

The Conceptual Framework has been categorised into two main sections in order to provide structure for the supporting background to the GA programme. These sections relate firstly to institutional or macro issues relating to policy and procedures, and secondly to issues affecting the individual through staff development and mentoring. The interaction of the two sections produce the framework of the GA programme at TN.

2.1 INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES - POLICY and PROCEDURE

As noted by Minkel & Richards(1983) in Brown-Wright, Dubrick and Newman (1997), policies on graduate assistantships will vary according to the nature, tradition and needs of individual institutions. Literature has shown the main purpose of international graduate assistantships to be that of the development of future faculty and their socialisation into the academic culture through recruiting and developing superior graduate students. The GA programmes nurture the development of the graduate students' leadership and other professional skills, while assisting the graduate to obtain a post-graduate qualification. In return the institution gains some general academic assistance, relieving pressure caused by institutional financial considerations and the competition for tenured faculty's time. Although assistantships are seen to presumably lead to the development of faculty in the USA there is an indication that this end reward is becoming less common, indeed there are far more GAs than potential tenured posts. This lack of "reward" at the end of a tenuous period is increasing the tension in the USA and is leading towards some of the problems regarding unionisation.

Apart from these factors, few recent institutions were found to have implemented a GA programme for more specific reasons. Studying the history of the GA system gives some indication of these underlying goals. Chase (1970: 3) traced the use of graduate teaching assistants in America back to 1876 when a need to "induce young men to undertake graduate study" saw the awarding of twenty fellowships a year by the president of the Johns Hopkins University, providing financial aid to attract advanced students. Although there were no teaching duties attached, these graduate students supplemented their income by teaching in nearby towns. This initiative was followed by other institutions and by the end of the century was common practice. The influx of students after the World War II saw the GA system grow substantially and this increased graduate enrolments. Chase (1970) quoted a professor from one university in the early 1950's as saying that some graduate schools were established specifically to provide the assistants needed to teach at the growing undergraduate level. From these beginnings the GA programme in America has grown, according to Richardson (1999) who quoted data from the US Department of Education, to 203 000 GAs in 1993. In 2000, the nearly 2300 GAs at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign (Fact Sheet, 2000) comprise 30% of postgraduate students and there is a ratio of 34.4 GAs per 1000 undergraduate students. The university supplied a comparison of nine similar universities, where it was established that for the 1999-2000 period there were a total of 15 309 GAs spread relatively evenly over the institutions.

A more recent example of a specific goal for the GA concept was identified by Bouchet (1993: 339) when he described the plan initiated by the French Ministry of Education who "set up a special programme in 1989 to introduce graduate assistants to teaching at university

level in order to meet projected teaching needs and to fill a gap that had opened when the recruiting system was drastically altered". Bouchet (1993) stated that prior to 1984, the French system was based on graduate teaching assistants. He commented that from then until 1989, it was not deemed necessary to develop GAs. In 1989 research found that, based on predictions of increased student numbers due to demographic growth; increasing need for higher education (and specifically further than the Baccalaureate) and predicted retirement rates, between 1500 and 2000 PhD graduates would have to be recruited each year. In France in 1993 there were around 4500 GAs in the university system.

The GA programme at TN is, in many respects, similar to international programmes, however its purpose was originally envisaged as a means to address TN's future employment equity requirements for academics. In order to achieve this goal, the programme was uniquely based on an affirmative action policy designed to develop specifically black, and preferably African, academics from the ranks of the diplomates holding national diplomas from programmes at TN. In identifying a specific need, the programme is similar to both the American history and the French strategic staffing programme. It even has implications for increasing the postgraduate enrolments similar to those identified in Chase (1970). Due to their relatively new status regarding the offering of degrees, technikons need to increase enrolments at these levels. Financial constraints are even more onerous at this adult learner level due to the increased level of responsibilities, such as paying for housing, supporting dependents and possibly the repayment of undergraduate loans, of most post graduate students. Although other South African universities are known to use GA programmes for the purposes of undergraduate tuition linked to post graduate qualifications, information about these programmes was minimal.

Although no other GA programmes specifically addressing affirmative action were identified, Weiner (1998) discussed how equal opportunities policies in higher education in the United Kingdom (UK) were being implemented and how a guide for equality for all UK higher education institutions had been produced. Part of this guide referred to staff recruitment, support and career development of specific inequalities such as women, ethnic minorities and the disabled. Weiner (1998) also noted that the UK is part of an international and global higher education movement which according to the United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organisation (UNESCO) has five significant trends including a shift to mass higher education, reduction of financial resources, concerns relating to quality maintenance, concerns about graduate employment and the resultant reassessment of curriculum, and the growing internationalisation and mobility of higher education. These trends are similar to those identified by South African higher education.

Boroviak (1991) in her study of 60 institutions in 30 states in the USA notes that the availability of graduate assistantships is a valuable tool in recruiting and retaining superior graduate students. Institutional financial considerations and competition for faculty time in activities other than teaching (ie research, publications, service, advising etc) have contributed to bring more and more GAs into part-time teaching, research and service roles on campus. She notes that studies have indicated that many basic instructional programs are reducing the use of the full-time professorial teaching responsibilities - this role being delegated to more GA's and part-time personnel.

Brown-Wright, Dubrick and Newman (1997) based their study on GAs and faculty in one American institution where they identified that the major purposes of graduate education

include the development of research and other professional skills and assisting graduates in becoming socialised into the academic culture. This is the active process by which new members acquire the core elements of a new culture, ie the various rules of behaviour and the assumptions behind them. They state that graduate assistantships have a major influence on developing graduate students' leadership roles. Role expectations of both GA and faculty have a major influence on the success of these experiences.

The discovery of similarities between the USA experience and the TN experience was reassuring. The issues which are not yet experienced at TN, such as union activity, may be due to the initial stage of the GA concept in SA. By studying the development of the issues relating to unionisation in the USA, TN may be able to anticipate problems and therefore avoid them by putting in place the measures necessary to promote a more successful programme. The GA programmes internationally seem to have fundamental similarities and disparities to those at TN. The disparities are particularly:- the qualification level of the GA (internationally focused mainly on Masters and Doctoral qualifications whereas at TN the focus is on BTech with few Masters students); funding mechanisms; type of GA programme (Teaching, Research, Administration); employment policy after completion; working conditions and facilities; policy and handbooks for communication; and vision/goal of the programme & reason for establishment. Similarities include:- remuneration packages; workload; teaching support programmes; multiple roles of the GA; difficulty in completing qualification; lack of permanent posts after completion and contracts.

What has transpired from the investigation at TN, and identified in questionnaire responses by both HODs and GAs, is that vision needs to be reevaluated in terms of the macro issues identified in this conceptual framework, and then a strategy for ensuring the programme will succeed needs to be designed. This strategy will need to be well defined and communicated to all stakeholders. Although the GA programme at TN has developed over the last few years, it has been guided mainly by the practical experiences gained by stakeholders of the programme. The research identified that few stakeholders had any knowledge of other national or international GA programmes, meaning that all development was based on actual experience. The similarities in the programmes that exist provide an excellent opportunity to further develop the programme at TN, optimising not only personal experience but documented and researched experiences as well. Schoenfeld and Magnan (1992:10) discuss a "real problem" as being confusion about the aim and destiny of the institution. They speak of strategy, "Where should we go?" and tactics, "How do we get there?" and then proceed to list four pages of questions drawn from various sources which face both institutions and individuals regarding higher education.

The GA programme, at TN and internationally, is shaped by the "Sacred Triad" of teaching / research / service (Schoenfeld and Magnan, 1992:12). These are the actual tasks or duties of an academic in respect of teaching, administration and the development of their teaching skills; research which may or may not be related to the improvement of their qualifications; and service to the institution, community or profession. For the GA programme - the focus is on the first two responsibilities. Most GA programmes add a formal teaching course to these two areas. The GA programme at TN requires success in each of these three areas in order to meet the desired equity outcome of the GA programme. Starting from a base of affirmative action with the goal of future employment equity provides specific challenges in each of these areas.

The relationship of these tasks, and the affirmative action and employment equity goals at Technikon Natal, is illustrated below:

Table No 1 Relationship of Affirmative Action Base, Tasks and Employment Equity Goals

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY Development of Black Academics to meet future equity needs		
Academic Assistance	Post Graduate Qualification	Academic Induction/Socialisation
GA assists with departmental work	GA obtains a BTECH or MTECH degree	GA learns the skills of the "trade"
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GAs are black, preferably African.		

The GA programme at TN is in the right place at the right time. It sits in the middle of debates around a restructured higher education for South Africa and the promotion of equity in academia. Much of this discussion is driven by economic and social pressure as changes in technology and lifestyles guide the way to the "high road" for South Africa's economy (and higher education), while the need to address problems relating to "the low road" (Sunter, 1992) challenge the success of the vision. As seen in earlier discussion, this is not only happening in South Africa. Internationally - direction and purpose for higher education are being discussed. Staffing issues and the role of the academic in the future global higher education scenario is being explored and these issues will need to be determined before a plan to develop future academics can be successfully developed.

In addition to these macro issues, the last four years have seen extensive reflection on the value of life long learning and outcomes based learning in South Africa. Discussion around the meaning of learning and process of development in learners has in turn provided new insights into staff development, educationally and in business and industry. As with all training and most education, staff development is no longer seen in isolation, a "course to go on", but becomes an integral part of the nature of the "job". The value obtained through the use of mentoring to support this integrated development is beginning to gain momentum. The GA programme encompasses all of these issues and more.

Since the early 1990's, education in South Africa has been working towards a cohesive system which will address the future demands of the country, economically and socially. Changes in higher education began with the establishment of the South African Qualification Authority (SAQA)(1995) and the new Higher Education Act (1997). Much work has been done at institutional level to align qualifications with the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and Outcomes Based Education (OBE). The Employment Equity Act (1995), the Skills Development Act(1998) and the Skills Development Levy Act (1999) all contribute to the background in which the changes to higher education will occur. The Shape and Size Report (2000) by the task team appointed by the Council for Higher Education will have considerable impact on the future structure of higher education. Higher education in South Africa is preparing for an intensive period of change likely to last at least another decade.

In his speech on "Issues in Higher Education: Imperatives for Equity and Redress" Kader Asmal (Oct 2000) stressed: "The need for restructuring is not unique to South African higher

education. All higher education systems across the world are restructuring both because of the changes occasioned by the revolution in information and communication technology, but also because of new demands for greater responsiveness and accountability to societal interests and needs." Asmal (ibid) acknowledged that South Africa's past history will make the process more difficult, and that the goal for a "single coordinated higher education system" will not happen overnight. Attainment of this goal would take "...careful planning...targeted use of resources... commitment and political will." Asmal (ibid) stressed again a term he has used in other speeches that there can be no more 'business as usual'. He anticipated the release of a national plan, including his response to restructuring proposals, in early 2001.

The proposed restructuring of higher education especially in KwaZulu Natal and with reference to the merger of TN and ML Sultan Technikon, needs to be considered in terms of both the extent of the restructuring and the time frame which will be allocated to implement the changes. These measures will also inform the mission of the new institution. The plan for the higher education structure for KwaZulu Natal and the mission for the new institution(s) will be crucial to the future of the GA programme.

Depending on the time frame for the restructuring, interim measures may be necessary. Although TN went through an extensive strategic planning exercise in 1998, the new higher educational proposals will require a similar exercise. The vision informing the last exercise was for TN to be the "leading educational and technological institution on the African continent" which, while being an honourable goal, was difficult for most HODs as they dealt with the realities of underprepared students, lack of financial and technological support and substantially increased managerial duties. Setting a new vision and mission for the institution which is perceived to be attainable by all stakeholders will be necessary.

The need to increase participation by black, African academics in education in South Africa is undisputed. It is in line with affirmative action as a means towards employment equity to address current staffing ratios which indicate a predominance of white, and mostly male, academics. The Shape and Size Report (2000) highlighted the inequality of race and gender representation for academic and administrative staff. All institutions were noted as having "...academic staff and senior administrative bodies that are dominated by males...particularly true of the higher (academic) ranks of professor and associate professor." The report identifies that "historically white universities and technikons, including those that have experienced rapid changes in the racial composition of their student bodies, continue to have academic and senior administrative staff bodies that are dominated by whites."

In light of this issue, the Shape and Size Report (2000) notes that among the most critical challenges facing the reconfiguration of higher education is "...improving the racial and gender representivity of staff". The proposals are for this to be done through the setting and monitoring of targets for (amongst other issues) staff equity. Measures to record the current status and changes in staff equity are in place with the development and maintenance of the "three-year rolling plans" all institutions were required to submit to government. These plans contain all the data necessary to make decisions about institutional progress and higher education, and lead into an information management system which will guide national policy.

Further on in the Shape and Size Report (2000), it is further stated that proposed equity targets could be set around "... the increased representation of black and women students

in the Science, Engineering and Technology (SET) areas of study" which has been identified as a critical need. This statement must be seen in conjunction with other statements which indicate the SET area of study is one of three areas - including those of the Humanities and Social Sciences, and Commerce and Business - and that a balance "...appropriate to the needs of a developing country..." is necessary between these areas. Determination of this need may have an impact on the GA programme which is currently biased in favour of Commerce programmes and males. This bias may not be an issue when considering the extent of inequalities that need addressing but should be debated conclusively either way before moving on.

Due to the GA concept at TN being centred around an affirmative action initiative, initial studies indicated that this presented certain unique issues in terms of staff development. Part of the problem in trying to appoint more African academics in terms of TN's Employment Equity Policy is the lack of available qualified and experienced African academics and so the success of the GA programme is of great significance. These issues are particularly encountered within departments and programmes with a SET focus. The Shape and Size Report (2000) identifies that nationally there are only 20 000 graduates in the fields relating to science including the health sciences, engineering and applied technology. With the demand of business to become more technologically advanced to compete for international trade, these graduates are often more inclined to follow careers in industry, than academia.

There is a further need than just that of the development of staff for industry, and academics for higher education needs. The critical shortage of experienced and qualified staff in industry and commerce is currently affecting the supply of industry based educators and trainers and therefore this affects the overall productivity of industry. This has been identified as a potential limiting factor in the implementation of the vision of the Skills Development Act in some industries.

The Shape and Size Report (2000) also identified the fact that there is still a very limited pool of postgraduates from technikons. Research funding for technikons was only introduced in 1994. Technikons were only given the right to award degrees in 1993 and to implement degree programmes only in 1995. As a result, they have not yet been able to establish any extensive postgraduate and research capabilities, though good potential is seen to exist at a few institutions. Each GA post, even if it does not terminate with an appointed lecturer, goes some way to address this shortage of personpower.

Internationally staffing structures in business and industry are changing to more flexible, generally part time staff, with different demands being required of staff. These changes are moving into academia as internationally, higher education strives to become viable in addition to meeting demands from the economy and society.

International influences regarding staffing in the higher education sector can be used as sources of information. Various works edited by Cuthbert (1996) add valuable background from an international perspective regarding working in higher education. Kogan et al (1994) poses the question of "Staffing Higher Education - Meeting new Challenges." In this work the issues of the changes in Academia which affect staffing issues are addressed in some detail. New issues relating to academic career planning and structures are discussed by Blaxter et al (1998). These studies show a critical understanding of the future of the Academic in Higher Education in terms of the changes happening in Academia. Academia is being faced

with challenges from educational changes and global business trends. Factors such as "Productivity" were seldom referred to in the Academia of the past. "Viability" and "marketisation" was not heard in relation to an academic department less than ten years ago. It is clear that the current scenario is very different to academia of the past. The goalposts have moved and academics need to learn the rules of the new game.

Meyer (1998) in her investigation in the United States of America (USA) into faculty workloads looks particularly at future directions and the perceptions and needs relating to faculty development. The factors affecting higher education in the USA are mirrored in South Africa. Meyer comments on the rising costs relating to higher education, as new technology requirements in both course material and delivery methods along with faculty demands for better benefits, are prompting society, and especially the tax payers, to query whether the value of higher education is worth the investment. She identifies the need for leadership, for further opportunities for adult education, and identifies that the state subsidy is decreasing due to demands from other sectors on the state budget. The ability of individuals to pay for their own education is decreasing with 74% of first year undergraduates in independent colleges in the USA needing financial assistance in 1994 (El-Khawas in Meyer, 1998:3).

With about 80 to 90% of an institution's budget being spent on personnel costs, Meyer (1998: 45-52) looks at the academic workload and productivity relating to research, teaching and service. She defines workload as "how time is spent" and productivity as "the measure of what is produced with that time". The workload of the GA is examined in the analysis of the data but productivity standards, or related assessment criteria, have not yet been debated at institutional level. These issues will have to be further studied in relation to what is expected of future academics in SA.

Changes in staffing structures are to be found in education and business. Kogan, Moses, and El Kharwas (1994: 50- 63), and Fulton (1996) discuss how staffing structures for higher education are changing in response to new demands in the United Kingdom. The work by Kogan et al (1994) is the product of an Institutional Management in Higher Education project carried out by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and based on research undertaken in the USA, Canada, Australia, the UK and other OECD countries. These works discuss how various factors will affect the staffing structures including institutional status, sectorial differentiation, changes in academic role structure and the growth of managerial and administrative functions.

Kogan et al (1994) and Fulton (1996) discuss how the binary system, where universities and non-universities (in SA - the Technikons etc) are segregated through forms of "...regulation, governance and funding...", determines different roles for their academics. Although the plans for a "...rational, seamless higher education system "(Asmal, 1999. Call to Action) in South Africa are being developed, it will be some time before these actually bear fruit. Fulton warns (1996: 160) that potential academic drift, mainly on the part of academics from non-universities with aspirations of greater scholarship, will be controlled by "limiting...their time and resources for research..." It will be only after the plans for the new higher education scenario are published, that direction for institutions, departments, academics and ultimately, the GAs, will emerge.

Fulton (1996) then draws on works by other researchers who identify other factors differentiating academics in the two sectors - those of the educators' social and educational

background and qualifications - alluding to the perception that staff of the former polytechnics (in England) are less well qualified than those of the 'old' universities. He goes on to state that these are often "... the features of the non-university sector which are viewed positively by recruits to these institutions". The comparison between the universities and non-universities in the UK are very similar to the comparisons between staff at the universities and technikons in South Africa. Most Technikon staff are selected mainly for their professional expertise and not their academic or educational knowledge. Students come to the Technikon to learn how to "do" a job, not to learn philosophy or psychology, for which they would go to a university. These differences will probably be maintained in the new structure for higher education and are categorised in the Shape and Size Report (2000). The issue behind this aspect is that work experience will be an issue in the future of lecturer appointments for the technikons. In terms of developing business and industry, experience is likely to be given even more importance. Valid and appropriate work experience will need to be built into the development programme for all lecturers - not just GAs.

Both Kogan et al (1994) and Fulton (1996) discuss the notion of academic rank. Internationally, different institutions use different criteria to determine the rank of the academics. Rank and career structure are noted as being under discussion in most European systems (Kogan et al. 1994). These discussions are being held amongst the GAs at TN some of whom identified the issue of rank as a concern. Some GAs indicated they would prefer to be called junior lecturers. At TN the rank of junior lecturer is currently given to lecturers who have not yet attained their M+4 (Matric plus four years of study ie BTech or equivalent), but there are lecturers with M+3 qualifications appointed prior to these criteria. At universities the theory is that lecturers should have a minimum of a Masters degree (M+5) even if in practice it may not always be the case. A clearer understanding of standard terminology and the status invested in these ranks would avoid misconceptions and illusions of exclusion.

Fulton (1996:165) notes there are common features between the national systems of England, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. These include the idea that teaching hours of non-universities are generally higher than that of universities (up to double), classes are generally smaller in non-universities, there is a "leaning towards" research at universities and a "leaning towards" teaching at non-universities with a lower publication rate at non-universities, research is either not supported or is funded to a limited extent in non-universities; and the bulk of postgraduate qualifications are offered by universities - although less so in England which has an increasing convergence of degree courses. He notes that the difference between term time and vacation working hours varies little with universities, but changes substantially within non-universities. There is a tendency for some non-university sectors to increase their research during this time, but most experience a drop in working hours. The debate around the time spent between researching and teaching is addressed by a number of writers. Ramsden, (in Cuthbert, 1996: 28) illustrates that there are less academics in the United Kingdom who "teach only" (about 10%) than those who "research only" (about 28%) with the majority of academics (about 61%) doing both research and teaching. Research capacity is growing at technikons and research output is becoming more "expected" of an academic at technikons. The GA is studying towards a postgraduate qualification. These factors mean that it would be desirable that should the GA be appointed as a lecturer, that they would continue with research. The GA must be prepared and equipped with the skills to take on this role.

Changes from a collegiate to a managerial system for educational institutions have been noted by a number of writers (Fulton, 1996:161; Kogan et al, 1994:19-23) especially in the non-university sector. However even as the changes seem inevitable and necessary, it will be important not to lose the good features of the collegial model - ie those of self initiative and intellectual freedom (Kogan et al, 1994:24). TN currently functions as do most UK universities on "...diarchical lines incorporating managerial and collegial lines of authority." (Kogan et al, 1994: 59). Part of the drive towards managerialism has been to invest Deans and HODs with clearer managerial authority. The increased administrative work that goes with the managerial system such as quality assurance, marketing, competition for resources and adherence to laws including those relating to labour, health and safety and copyright issues mean these in turn need to be delegated to academic staff. Academic staff in the future, and by default this includes the GA, will need to be prepared to contribute more time and expertise towards the running of a department.

The role of the academic is mainly determined by the type of institution in which they are employed (Fulton, 1996:160). This has consequences for all academics when they deliberate as to in which institution they belong, and what steps will have to be taken / decisions made as to where their futures will lie. The trend internationally is seeing institutions and business increasingly using part-time staff in order to meet the demands for flexibility and controlling the cost of employment (Kogan et al, 1994:55).

The discussion document (2000: 6) prior to the Shape and Size Report stated that "Institutions with open or relatively relaxed admission requirements would be funded for extensive involvement in academic development programmes" and that this way of dealing with inadequately prepared students will therefore be more efficient and more effective. Fulton (1996:160) states that if it were possible, academics "...aspire to teach postgraduates or better qualified undergraduates". With the large numbers of underprepared learners coming into higher education, academics need to be prepared to address their particular needs. The GAs having, in most cases, recently been undergraduates, and coming from a similar cultural background to the younger learners, are uniquely situated to provide guidance to these students. This was noted by the GAs in response to the questionnaires. However, this must be a guided programme, and the success must not be left to chance.

It is not only in academia that there are great changes in the way we work. Industry and commerce are experiencing similar turbulence. Robbins (1997) in his management text book, "Managing Today!" spells out for new graduates and management alike, the need to play by a different and complex set of rules. Robbins is not just a sensationalist regarding change - he draws heavily on prominent and current business articles and links these with references to other academic writings. The parallels between the changes in business and the changes in academia, and the affect these will have on the new role of the academic, are significant. Karathanos (1999) quoted statements such as: "what was once an acceptable fit between societal needs and institutional performance is becoming increasingly unacceptable to those who finance the institution" (Chaffee and Sherr, 1991); and "Higher education can learn from factories. Principles for assuring quality...grounded in a clear sense of mission, concern for people and high expectations - can and should be emulated" (Hubbard, 1994: 97) which show the concern about education. His article on quality in higher education provides stimulus for the South African situation where quality issues are becoming more crucial. The establishment of Education and Training Quality Assurance bodies in all economic sectors means most technikon programmes will need to pay attention

to both the higher education sector and the industry sector who would employ their graduates. Hence the parallels between business and academia are no longer as diverse as they were in the past.

Academia must try to adapt and manage in an academic world undergoing dramatic changes. Change must be turned into a positive experience, and participation is the only way to do this. An example is the NQF and SAQA. Industry was first introduced to this concept in the early 1990's. Academic participation in qualification structures and Education and Training visions only began early in 1997. Even after an intensive four years of "SAQA speak" some academics still say this is a flash in the pan. The changes are forcing academics to learn and question everything relating to their purpose and jobs. Academics, as with managers, are needing to be "...spending an increasing amount of time walking ...and talking...sharing information and listening" (Robbins, 1997: 4). There are many stakeholders that need to be "brought along" with the changes education is experiencing - such as staff, students, colleagues, industry members, related programmes, that much of an academics time is taken up by reassuring, informing, debating and challenging the status quo.

Robbins (1997: 3-24) discusses the importance of the new economy, the new organisation and the new employee. Each of these areas has an impact on academia and the role academics will play in the future. The new economy is the environment in which we work. The Global Village is as much an issue in academia as business, not only in what is happening around the world in academic trends, but also with regard to the impact on learning programmes to prepare our students for these new challenges. A number of factors presented by Robbins (1997: 7-9) affect academia: competition, technology, protectionism and new markets.

Academia has not really yet embraced the "Information Wave". Educational delivery methods will include more use of technology and different structuring of curriculum, changing from supplying knowledge to students to guiding learners knowledge accumulation. Computer and information literacy, and the ability to pass on this knowledge, will be vital for the GA as they will be entering an era where the use of these skills will be mandatory.

The new organisation, according to Robbins(1997:12) will include aspects relating to a more culturally diverse workforce, in terms of gender, age, race, and ethnicity. Awareness of attitudes and prejudices, sexual harassment, workers with disabilities, legal issues and corporate objectives needs to be addressed. Issues relating to race are also discussed by Marcia Sutherland (1990) where she identifies the difficulties facing black faculty in white USA institutions. Sutherland (1990) recounts personal experiences relating to the initial recruitment of staff of colour, classroom experiences and difficulties with students, responses to white racism, life on campus and away from work. The Shape and Size Report (2000) acknowledges that while racial composition of student enrollments has changed rapidly, staffing of institutions is still predominantly white. Many issues raised by Sutherland are applicable to TN. Stereotyped attitudes will need to be addressed and a more encompassing and tolerant attitude for differences will need to be developed. It is not enough to proclaim open-mindedness, for there are often deep seated attitudes towards gender, age and race differences which may be totally sub-conscious. The affirmative action nature of the GA programme presents opportunities relating to a proactive approach to increased cultural diversity management for HODs, other departmental staff and students. In many departments the GA has been the first black staff member.

Another issue facing management of the new organisation is that of Quality Management (Robbins, 1997: 13 and Karathanos, 1999). Quality assurance and accountability in education has been gaining momentum over the past ten years. Technikons are used to certification by SERTEC every four years and the self-evaluation process preceding the "inspection". SERTEC is involved in all academic matters - including all programmes, examinations, libraries and co-operative education. The new qualifications framework will establish ETQA's (Education and Training Quality Authorities) for all academic areas, not just technikons. The role quality assurance will play is going to increase over the next few years.

The role of the academic will incorporate a need to be accountable for the quality of all aspects of the academic ambit. This will need to be incorporated into the design of the GA programme and the appraisals for annual renewal of the GA contract will need to prove the quality is being maintained.

Robbins(1997:16) discusses how businesses are needing to focus on what they do best and what makes them special. This could mean closing down non-core business, and if necessary, contracting that area out to specialists. This is needed to cut costs, improve efficiency and increase flexibility. No matter how traumatic closing down programmes or departments may be, and even considering all reassurances by government that restructuring will not affect jobs, it is up to every academic, in every department, to ensure they have the knowledge and skills which are needed by the new educational scenario. It will not be enough to develop GAs in the mould of current academics. Development of the GA needs to project what the needs relating to the academic in the future may be. Continual development and growth will certainly be part of the job description for academics.

The flexible workday and workplace will mean perceptions relating to normal working hours could be expected to change. Robbins (1997: 17) identifies that "...workers are staying at home - networking their computer to the ones at the office and telecommuting". Many academics already have developed offices at home. Schoenfeld and Magnan (1992: 15) in their book on climbing the ladder to tenure in the USA, state that an academic seeking tenure should be willing to make "...an appropriate financial investment..." of their own in items of computer hardware and software, setting up physical workspace and facilities at home, a professional library, and "...summers spent working in laboratory, library or field in lieu of vacation". Robbins, (ibid) goes on to state that "...an increasing number of organisations are keeping their offices open permanently to accommodate diverse schedules of employees, or for employees to be working 70 or 80 hours per week." The GA should be encouraged to expect a future where academic hours of work become irregular, extended and unconventional.

Robbins (1997: 23) notes that the new employee, or the new academic, will be affected by the trend to evaluate performance and cost. It will be dependant on the academic to prove their worth. Performance appraisal systems for academics and GAs need to be established. Academics will need to keep their skills current through maintaining self directed careers. People are now expected to change careers four to six times in their lives. This means learning new things every five to ten years with most of this learning taking place in addition to current work responsibilities. Coping with stress will be part of the skills an individual must learn in order to survive in the world of work. Stress in the life of the academic is growing proportionately with the new roles expected. From a protected existence in the realms of research and academic debate, sabbaticals and long vacations arriving in the new millennium has been a cruel awakening.

Pearce (1999) conducted an USA study of 263 business schools which identified who could influence the changes needed in colleges. These groups included top educational administrators, students and parents, faculty, media coverage, institutional competitors and external government organisations. Pressure from all of these sources is pertinent to the South African situation. Issues, again common to South Africa and the USA, targeted included relevance, cost, delivery method, and value. Some of the recommended solutions to the USA situation may have value for South Africa. These included recommendations such as: awards to faculty for superior performance, making business experience a co-requisite to qualifications for faculty, courses on how to teach, sabbaticals to gain business experience, eliminate tenure, increase technology budgets, increase distance learning technologies, and design curriculums to contain work experience. The extent of these deliberations indicates that the changes in South Africa are heading in the right direction, but are possibly still moving too slowly. Many of these initiatives can be implemented immediately in the GA programme at TN and can drive the momentum for future staff development.

However, caution must be taken that all these changes are not simply a cycle of the economy. Many of these trends seem to be affected by the desire to simply keep changing, to keep trying something new. The Japanese phrase adopted by industry of "continual improvement", could well become the motto for the new GA.

Minkel and Richards (1983) presented "A model policy for Graduate Assistantship Administration" where they developed a model based on surveyed employment conditions during 1980 for GAs at 56 major institutions in 50 states. Implementation varied according to the nature, tradition, and needs of the institutions. The model includes the philosophy of graduate assistantships, types, qualifications for appointment, appointment procedures, levels of employment, conditions of service, privileges, rights, responsibilities evaluation and reappointment.

Similar programmes are discussed in the University of North Carolina's and the University of Maryland's handbooks for GAs. These documents would provide a sound base on which to base administrative processes at TN.

2.2 INDIVIDUAL ISSUES - STAFF DEVELOPMENT and MENTORSHIP

A critical area relating to the GA programme that needs further investigation is to establish what is required to become an academic, and then to build this into the development programme. Schoenfeld and Magnan (1992: 2) describe this as focusing not only on what an academic does, but also on what an academic is and should be. They suggest that individually, academics should develop a vision for themselves considering the opportunities and responsibilities that go along with a life in academia. In SAQA terms - establish not only the purpose, but also the outcomes and the assessment criteria, before developing the course contents. This focus would lead to the lifelong learning process which is part of the new thinking in education in South Africa.

While developing a support programme for GAs, there are many issues should also be considered. GAs in general have a number of roles to play. These relate to the variety of tasks set before them, their level of development, and their environment - in the institution, the department and the programme. Nowlis, Clark and Rock (1968:2) describe the role of the GA in relation to the undergraduates as being one of four common roles. These range from someone in the background who hardly meets the students and is used for clerical work and marking, through various degrees of increasing responsibility until they become an advanced student with full responsibility of a course. Nyquist and Wulff (1996: 19) suggest GAs move through three phases in their period of contract, that of Senior Learner, Colleague in Training and finally, Junior Colleague. They note these phases have implications for supervision and responsibility.

Multiple Roles of GAs

Feezel and Meyers (1997), found that GAs experience eight interrelated types of communication concerns (Self, task, impact, role conflict, teaching area knowledge, procedural knowledge and time management) in their article on "Assessing Graduate Assistant teacher communication concerns". They go on to show that GA variables of expected duties, prior teaching experience, newness to area, foreign or domestic birth and age are likely to predict different types of concerns. Many of these variables relate to the GAs at TN as well, in addition to factors relating to the affirmative action nature of the programme such as concerns related to culture, race and gender.

Koehnecke (1991) discussed how GAs have multifaceted roles which were often in conflict with each other. Some of the GAs major concerns were 1) unreasonable workload, 2) isolation, 3) frenzied pace, 4) work not enjoyable, 5) difficult boss, 6) poor work environment, 7) restrictions, 8) stereotypical roles, 9) responsibility without authority, and 10) low pay. She noted the assistants who handled the pressure best were able to bounce off their boundaries and work within their departments to implement change.

Teaching Programmes

Sullivan, Svinicki and Greer (1997) in their study of approximately 500 GAs in America, identified that many institutions, discouraged with the results of traditional methods of teacher training, were redesigning their GA programmes in order to improve the preparation for teaching. Their study found that while training courses were important, being given responsibility for a course was associated with the most gains in the GAs' role identification

as a teacher. In their study, the GA programme was a combination of supervised teaching with a discipline specific, rather than generic, one semester course on teaching theory. They too, identified that the marginal role the GA played, neither student nor academic, affected the preparation of most GAs. These observations have been noted at TN, where GAs who were actually teaching classes were far more inculcated into the teaching profession than those GAs who were only assisting or tutoring. Care has to be taken that the courses chosen are at a suitable level and that both GA and undergraduates are benefiting from the arrangements. Koehnecke (1991) also identified that GAs who were assigned challenging tasks and given opportunities for growth within the department appeared more able to cope. Another angle to this concept was suggested by Jackson (1983) in Brown-Wright et al (1997) where he stated that a graduate student who does not teach will have to gain that experience when hired as professor. The costs related to this learning curve are then relocated and therefore increase. Again, the sooner the GA is standing in front of a class at TN, the sooner the benefits will be seen. The research done for this study indicated that a small proportion of the GAs at TN did not teach alone at all during their first year. This practice must be addressed, as the department should, when appointing a GA, be confident in their ability to become a teacher. However, it must be repeated that the choice of the course to be taught, the support provided and the preparation of the undergraduate students must be considered.

As illustrated in Sullivan et al (1997) some GAs at TN had expressed that they were not ready to implement the theory learned on the general teaching induction programme, usually during their first semester as a GA, while they are still acclimatising themselves to the other roles they are required to play. In addition, some GAs commented that they were more interested in teaching aspects relating directly to their field of interest, rather than a general approach. A departmental approach, based perhaps on general guidelines, would also assist in involving more academics in a wider discussion on similar educational matters. It would also reduce the discomfit felt by the GA in circumstances, usually avoided, where the GA needed to "try to teach the experienced staff about educational matters". Sullivan et al (1997) found in their investigations that while neither an organised teaching course nor a trained instructor sustained a positive impact in role identification, they still felt these prepared the GAs better for teaching.

Roach and Jensen (1997) explored Bandura's Social Learning Theory in the development of GAs theoretical grounding in education. Along with the usual verbal guidance courses, they used symbolic modelling, combining the theory with the practice of teaching, in order to increase the GA's effectiveness in the classroom. They also noted this increased the GA's credibility in the classroom. Although a perception of the students, credibility is affected by things such as teacher communication (verbal and non-verbal) style and classroom management and in turn has been shown to be an important factor in student ratings of instructor effectiveness. Due to the small age gap between GA and undergraduate students and lack of experience of the GA, credibility is a critical issue. Roach and Jensen(1997) extensively discuss credibility issues relating to the GAs and the underpinning components of competence and character. Credibility is linked to the difficulty some GAs at TN expressed in their efforts to bridge the gap between treating undergraduates as their friends or as students. Using a similar programme of symbolic modelling may assist the GA at TN to further integrate educational theory and practice.

Various other authors describe teacher training programmes including Boroviak, (1991) in her study of 60 institutions from 30 states in the USA, Sheehan et al (1986) and Bouchet

(1993) in his description of the French programme. Brown-Wright et al (1997) described various courses identified as important by 151 GAs and 72 faculty members at one institution in America. Most of these training programmes were based on the premise that teaching can be learned, practised and continually improved. This international literature showed that teaching programmes offered varied from ten to twelve days and are sometimes concentrated, with others spread across a semester. Various forms such as workshops, lectures and talks were used. The training courses provide an opportunity for the GAs to meet and forge useful ties. The courses cover in general: good organisation (of course and in general), alternative teaching methods and effectiveness, how to properly prepare a syllabi, goal and priority setting, techniques for coping with stress, methods of projecting enthusiasm, knowledge of subject matter, understanding what to expect from freshman students, campus facilities and services, group instructional skills, teaching techniques, the way in which the universities work, employment problems and international relations, macro educational issues, broad educational aspects and micro teaching skills, management of the GA training programme, the information and policy manual, implementation of a teaching seminar, evaluation, feedback and support.

Darling and Earhart (1990) in their development of a model to prepare GAs as educators identified that the development of an information and policy manual in the form of a handbook which was updated yearly, was an important reference for new teachers. Along with institutional concerns, their handbook also included sections on teaching responsibilities related matters.

Another national American initiative drawing attention is the "Preparing Future Faculty" (PFF) programme which began in 1993. This programme clusters faculty, administrators and GAs from universities with other institutional partners focusing on undergraduate programmes. In a South African scenario - this could mean the Technikons pairing with Technical Colleges. Gaff and Lambert (1996) note the PFF programme has advantages and disadvantages, with most reservation coming from experienced faculty. They indicated that as more GAs were going through the programme, they were seeing greater acceptance and motivation on the part of the faculty. The concept of such a cluster could be developed for a greater reach of the programme in addition to the other spin-offs related to partnerships with other institutions.

Staff Development at TN

The history of the Technikon sector has had an affect on current staff development practices at TN. Graduates in the past were usually keen to get into industry and start gaining work experience soon after obtaining a diploma, and this is due to the technological nature of most Technikon programmes. Staff recruitment therefore placed greater emphasis on workplace experience than on postgraduate qualifications. Once staff were appointed, discipline specific higher qualifications were encouraged and in recent times, this has become the requirement for obtaining a permanent post. This drive for higher qualifications is relatively new in the Technikon and has increased in momentum since the early 1990's with the advent of the degrees at technikons and the extensive national legislation, discussion and investigations regarding education in South Africa. Unaudited figures from the Committee of Technikon Principals showed that in 1997, nearly 40% of permanently appointed lecturers at TN had less than M+4 qualifications, about 23% had M+4, and less than 40% had M+5 or M+6. This is partly due to the Technikons only offering degrees from 1994, although higher diploma qualifications have been in place in some programmes for some time.

Staff development at TN has become more structured since the mid 1980's when a study by Prior (1986) looked at newly appointed academic staff development at TN. In this study Prior tracked the development of the Technikon sector and the associated staff development initiatives in order to develop a model for future staff development. She looked at the major considerations concerning the needs of newly appointed staff, and the needs of the institution. Her study also analysed the particular concerns relating to lecturers as they moved from early stages of lecturing through the development of some experience in the job. This model formed the basis of academic staff induction at TN through to the late 1990's.

More recent staff development practices have been forming around outcomes from the Education, Training and Development Practitioners sector and a new programme in conjunction with the University of Natal is being designed (AQU Position Paper, 2000). The proposed programme is a move towards planned career pathing for academics and the achievement of credits towards higher qualifications in educational matters as opposed to the more discipline specific higher qualifications.

The current Staff Induction Programme (TN Probation Policy, 1999) is based on a two year probationary period, with the first year designed around orientation and induction and the second year around evaluation and development. The Staff Induction Programme includes a fifteen week course of teaching development seminars on Friday afternoons and the development and submission of a portfolio demonstrating competency in the specified outcomes. These outcomes include designing a teaching programme; using a wide range of teaching and learning strategies; providing support to students in academic and pastoral matters; using a wide range of assessment methods; evaluating work with a range of self, peer and student monitoring; performing effectively in teaching support and administrative matters; developing professional and personal coping strategies; gaining an appreciation of the particular educational concerns of own discipline; reflecting on own personal and professional practice and making a plan for continuing professional development; and identifying and meeting departmental outcomes. The portfolio, due for submission in the second year of the probation, is a relatively new technique of assessment at TN and while this concept has potential for creating a dynamic culture of reflection in academia, it is still in the early stages of acceptance at TN. Although the proposed programme at TN includes GAs in its target population, the desired outcomes may be too much to expect of a first level GA along with all their other duties.

Trends in Staff Development

Cox (1995) discusses the need to enhance the teaching abilities of junior faculty through an extended development programme. He noted the dichotomy, seen in the GAs at TN, where high levels of optimism and motivation contrast with the multiple stresses faced by young academics. Cox (1995:295) recommends that first year faculty are not overloaded and that there is an emphasis on collegiality during development sessions. He suggests a year long teaching programme in the second year. These recommendations were suggested by a GA at TN during the research for this study.

Tickle (1994) in his project to develop a teaching induction programme for primary and secondary teachers in the UK, discussed ways of encouraging reflective professional practice in new teachers. He compared two initiatives for induction programmes, one a more generalised approach, and the other, his initial project, was more focused. From these

comparisons he argued that effective induction should include a range of elements, namely: conditions and nature of the appointment, provision of employment information and induction support, job-related support and department information, and regular contact with a skilled teacher (ibid: 160). Tickle (1994) proposed new teachers used the first year as a form of action research, and in his study, he kept extensive records which formed the basis of discussions. This process could be adopted by TN in the form of a portfolio compiled by the GA, but unlike the current portfolio - this should be department based. As Nyquist and Wulff (1994: 79) stated, most supervisors wish students could write better. They suggest a developmental approach to writing should be used. Combining these thoughts would mean TN could develop students reflective ability and writing skills while improving their teaching skills. Documenting development in this area during the first year of the GA contract would provide a basis for discussion with mentor or HOD and would lead to a sound base for teaching induction in the second year.

Another consideration, as commented on by Brown-Wright et al(1997), is that of other extraneous programmes such as non-technical skills, computer skills and mentoring programmes. De Lange (1998) discusses a project aimed at providing graduates with the skills to cope with the demands of the workplace. The GA programme at TN provides the unique opportunity for departments to become employers of their own "produce". This promotes reflection on the ability of the undergraduate programme to provide the student with these very important skills. As De Lange suggests, many programmes concentrate only on technical skills and theoretical knowledge, and that these are no longer sufficient for many employers who are in turn facing economical pressures. He quotes from Guirdham (1990:3 in De Lange, 1998) who stated: "the process of social interaction, work attitudes and behaviours is the glue that holds organisations together." De Lange proposes a programme combining functional skills - such as communication, information management and creative thinking and problem solving skills; and adaptive skills - such as self management, work-related dispositions and attitudes, group effectiveness and teamwork and organisational effectiveness.

These skills are reflected in the critical cross field outcomes as proposed by SAQA. Along with these skills is the need to ensure that the development of GAs prepares them to cope with the changing demands of higher education. Technology, qualification quality requirements, student issues (mass, level of preparedness, adult learners etc), institutional restructuring and cost constraints are some of the factors contributing to increased demands for the development of the GA.

Bollington, Hopkins and West (1990) discuss the practicalities of teacher appraisal. This work contrasts the institutional or bureaucratic appraisal with an individual or professional approach. They focus on the developmental aspect of evaluation as it happens in the classroom. Bollington et al (1990:5) recommend the use of professional evaluation includes teachers as assessors rather than administrators, contextual and varied teaching methods rather than a fixed set of outcomes, and treats teachers differently according to their assignments, stages of development and classroom goals. This approach may be needed for the GAs at TN rather than the generic induction course. However, the departments hosting the GA will need more support in terms of teaching methodology, and this will need to be the responsibility of the HOD and mentors.

Mentoring

Mentoring is associated with the success of GA programmes by most writers on the subject of GAs. Fullerton (1998) notes that in mentoring a GA there is no one faultless recipe. Their multiple roles and contexts mean that even within one institution, a flexible programme should be developed. Fullerton (1998) deals with five themes fundamental to the design of a mentorship programme to support the GA. These are the qualities of the mentor, expectations GAs have of their mentors, mentoring practice, issues and concerns of the mentor-mentee relationship and the identification of mentor development programmes.

Nyquist and Wulff (1996: 3) address the supervisory challenges of faculty in preparing GAs to become better teachers or researchers. They state "assisting graduate students to become independent, reflective, and collaborative problem solvers in both teaching and researching is an exciting enterprise worth our time, expertise and best efforts". They also identified that some faculty members would want to supervise research assistants while others would be happier with teaching assistants due to the nature of the faculty's personal career goals. Because the supervision and mentorship process is so important to the success of the programme, it would be beneficial to allow these natural tendencies to influence the direction of each GA post. The concern of GAs regarding the assignment of supervisors, was noted Brown-Wright et al (1997) and was identified in this study at TN.

Baker (1993), Cox (1995), Brown-Wright et al (1997), Boice (1992) and many other writers note that mentoring is beneficial to the mentee, the mentor and the institution, that it is a symbiosis of both teaching and learning. It enhances individual development of both mentee and mentor. Mentors can provide challenging assignments and influence a students' career advancement through new technical skills and career planning skills. Through mentoring the student learns to cope with the formal and informal structure of the organisation. Baker (1993) illustrated how mentoring GAs can assist them to overcome the void in the professional development of young teachers.

Brown-Wright et al (1997) in their study of 151 American GAs and 72 faculty members tried to establish congruence between the role expectations of these two groups. They found however that in most cases, GAs viewed themselves as possessing certain skills to a greater extent than faculty indicated they expected students to possess. They used a model of transition developed by Schlossberg (1984) to compare how graduate students defined their role, with their perception of how faculty defined their role. Interpersonal support in the degree of respect conveyed by faculty towards the GA, the level of informality of interactions and the faculty's treatment of graduate students as adults were found to be important. In this study it was found that GAs preferred to be given tasks and responsibilities as GAs rather than research assistants or administrative assistants. Most faculty however would prefer administrative assistants. The study did not find significant differences between faculty skill expectations and GA skill possession for skills such as assisting with administrative tasks, library research, advising students and teaching.

With the increase of litigation in American society, Bernard (1994) and Peach and Reddick (1987) discussed the legal and ethical dimensions of supervision and development of GAs. Bernard included aspects of competence - in supervision of task and the process of supervision; confidentiality - knowing how to maintain confidentiality in addition to knowing when and how it should or could need to be broken; and liability - especially relating to the

avoidance of a situation through fear of litigation. Peach et al (1987), caution against the potential negligence of educational malpractice where teachers and administrators do not carry out their responsibilities to their students and students do not learn what they should have. Specific concerns related to the proper training of GAs for their responsibilities, seen from the aspect of increased undergraduate education by GAs and the potential for educational disaster should this factor not be given the attention it deserves. This legal quagmire was also identified by Oppenheim (1997).

Winberg (1999) discusses the role of mentoring in the South African context particularly with reference to Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET). His work is both a reference book and a training manual for educators who wish to become mentors. The book brings to the attention the need to assist the GA themselves to become mentors in their own rights - as they too are mentoring undergraduates. Including a workshop on mentoring in the early stages of their contracts would assist the GA in this regard. Mullen and Lick (1999) edited a collection of works on mentoring which illustrated how an integrated culture of mentoring can be built into education. This has specific value for the mentoring programmes at TN. The mentoring initiative at TN is still in its infancy, but all efforts should be made to encouraged to grow, not only for the benefit of the GA programme, but for the greater institutional community.

Completion of Qualification

One of the difficulties of the GA programme is that of balancing all the tasks of the GA and this is complicated by the various reasons for wanting to become a GA. For some it is the lure of opportunity to study further and for others it is the desire to teach, notwithstanding the discovery that some GAs enter the programme because there are no other jobs available, and in other cases, the department is in need of additional assistance and the GA seems a good way of getting this at no additional cost to the department. Feezel and Myers (1997) recorded that about 41% of GAs in their research in one institution in America, planned to continue teaching after their contract terminated, 21% intended studying further, 25% planned a non-academic career and the balance were still undecided. In most cases, completion of their qualification is a prerequisite for further career moves by the GAs.

However, Chase (1970), Koehnecke (1991), Bouchet (1993), Boice (1992) and Nowlis et al (1968) note that completion of their qualification during the period of the GA contract is problematic. Statistics show that this is similar for TN where only about half of the past GAs completed their qualifications in the time allocated. Attention to ensuring completion should become a focus of the GA programme at TN, especially in order to maximise the state funding received for students registered for higher qualifications. Academic support, including improving writing and researching skills, necessary to ensure this has been discussed in the analysis of the data.

GA unionisation

Internationally, graduate assistantships and unionisation are the topic of extensive debate. No indication of references to GAs and union representation at Technikon Natal were seen in the data collected for this research. However with the new Labour Relations Act and the climate of industrial relations in South Africa, the possibility of future representation must be considered. Learning from international experience can mean measures to address

dissatisfaction can be implemented prior to the occurrence of a problem. The most important aspect to consider is whether the GAs are 'legally' students, departmental assistants or lecturers, as this will have an affect on their choice of representative body. Current options for GA representation would include SRC, NEHAWU and NUTESA.

Wildavsky (2000) traces the international growth of unionisation among GAs to the diminishing of an "implicit social contract that once ruled the nation's universities." He notes that the graduate assistantship was once regarded as a trade-off. "In the short term, students would spend a few years of living below the poverty line, slaving away on a thesis, performing teaching and research chores, and perhaps occasionally walking the professor's dog. In the long term, however, they could look forward to the security of a tenured job and a chance to live the life of the mind." Nowadays tenured job prospects for academics are far less certain. The rapid growth in part-time teaching jobs without tenure has meant most GAs will not become tenured academics in the future. Ratnesar (1999) illustrated that of 8000 students receiving PhD's in the humanities between 1996 and 2000, less than half would land full-time tenured jobs. This has meant GAs are far more concerned now as to how they are treated during their assistantships.

In the past, American GAs were deemed to be students and not employees. Wildavsky (2000) stated the reasoning was that the GAs' teaching or researching jobs were a form of financial aid and opportunity to experience academia. Union representatives said however that GAs are an easily exploited form of cheap labour, and in particular union organisers looked at health care issues, pay related issues and overwork issues. Unionisation of GAs has been a battle in the USA for over 20 years, but there are now 22 unions bargaining on 40 campuses on behalf of GAs. Although the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) in America has ruled since the 1970's that graduate employees at private institutions are not employees, and are therefore not eligible for unionisation under the National Labor Relations Act, even this may change.

Wildavsky (2000) and Ratnesar (1999) comment on the growing concern caused by this activity. From the faculty perspective this activity has seen mentors put into an "odd place". The issue of a GA joining a union - especially the Auto Workers Union as the main representative body - caused a divide in the bond between faculty and GAs. Some faculty saw this as a move by unions to survive rather than the egalitarian representation of issues relating to GAs, as one member commented "In an era of declining union membership, unions...see thousands of new members in the ranks of graduate students." (Smith in Wildavsky, 2000).

Ratnesar (1999) illustrated the reasons behind the unionisation when he wrote about the difficulties facing a GA. He reported on the working conditions of Connie Razza, a 26 year old PhD GA at UCLA, stating a 30 hour week at a salary which didn't cover her expenses. She was expected to give lectures, run a discussion section, grade papers and exams and hold office hours in a basement room where 40 other GAs shared 29 desks and one computer. Razza indicated that her teaching tasks had prevented her from finishing her dissertation.

Sharnoff (1993) commented that the GA was "neither fish nor fowl" and this dilemma as to whether the GA was an apprentice or an employee was further discussed by Vaughn (1998). Sharnoff (1993) argued that low pay, lack of fringe benefits, poor working conditions and

uncompromising administration attitudes forced GAs to redress their grievances through unionisation and ultimately work stoppages. She noted that the university administration took an extremely adversarial position regarding graduate employee unionisation. While GAs believed faculty would support their cause, most academics supported the administration. Sharnoff argued that the unionisation exposed, rather than created, some basic tensions related to graduate study. These included: 1) GAs do not enjoy rights and protections of other university employees, 2) GAs employment is limited in duration and tenuous in nature, 3) graduate student / faculty collegiality is not encouraged, 4) the nature of graduate study encourages a spirit of rivalry among graduate students and faculty. Vaughn (1998), five years after Sharnoff's article, also commented on the theoretical but not practical support by faculty and administration.

This brief synopsis of the situation in America is not included to provide 'ammunition' on the part of stakeholders at TN. The positive attitude of the stakeholders will hopefully prevent this happening. It is however an important aspect relating to transparency and a desire to learn from international experiences. Opening access to international resources at TN could mean opening potential for conflict if measures are not adopted to address concerns. This process of catharsis may well be necessary in order for the GA programme to develop.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY and METHODS

An exploratory case-study approach (Yin, 1994: 5) proved to be an appropriate method to research the individual and institutional experiences at Technikon Natal relating to the GA scholarship programme. Yin (1994: 38-40) discussed four types of designs for case studies. The type relating to this study is the Single Case design with embedded or multiple units of analysis. The rationale supporting the choice for a single case is due to the unique nature of the GA programme and because the programme at TN has not been studied before, this study would provide an insight into the problem. As discussed in Bell (1999: 10) this research provided the opportunity to study the phenomenon in some depth over a limited period of time. Bell (ibid) continues by stating "Case study is concerned principally with the interaction of factors and events" and this is illustrated in this study which was based on qualitative responses from the key stakeholders, supported by documentary evidence. The qualitative nature of the individuals' responses allowed the researcher to explore some of the key issues related to the programme, in addition to showing the interaction between these issues and the institutional issues which were mainly explored through documentary evidence.

The key stakeholders in the programme were identified for the purpose of this study as the GAs themselves and their HODs. Although most GAs had mentors, due to the varied nature of this initiative and because of the responsibility and accountability of the HOD, the HOD was the preferred contact person in the department. The views of persons in management, namely the Vice-Principal Academic and the Deans of Faculties provided input on institutional matters. Other stakeholders include the past GAs who had been appointed to lecturing posts in addition to personnel from support departments such as Human Resources who are concerned mainly with institutional issues, and the Academic Quality Unit who are more concerned with the individual.

The unique nature of the programme, as an affirmative action staff development mechanism, meant that many new issues arose from the data collected. Bell (1999:11) commented that a case study could be used as "... a means of identifying key issues which merit further investigation...", and this potential has been identified by the researcher in regard to this particular study.

The qualitative method was chosen in order to describe the actual perceptions of the key stakeholders relating to the GA programme in order to establish a meaningful analysis of the main issues. Although possibly subjective in certain sensitive instances, these personal experiences have lent value to the research. Reliability and validity of information may additionally be increased since responses from informants were often similar, and these were in turn corroborated by information obtained from international literature.

Transparency and candour was maintained by the researcher during the data collection and all questionnaires and interviews were preceded by information regarding the purpose of the study and issues of confidentiality. While the researcher acknowledges personal involvement in the programme from an HOD's perspective, issues relating to possible bias were considered at all stages of the research. Yin (1994: 88), and Marshall and Rossman (1999:106), mention the issue of bias as a problem relating to participant observation techniques but also discuss how this technique provides opportunity as well. These opportunities included the fact that as the researcher was known to most other HODs and

a number of GAs, this possibly assisted in both obtaining a high response rate to the questionnaires and in the openness the respondents displayed. Serious consideration was given to the relationship between opportunities and personal bias and the conclusion reached indicated that the value of the research would be enhanced through personal participation, with due regard for bias. After consideration, the researcher participated in completion of the HODs questionnaire in order to produce relevant data for questions relating to specific details such as facilities, working hours etc and to protect the identity of the GA. Responses were limited to factual information and not opinion.

Issues relating to confidentiality were considered in depth as all responses were identifiable at source. Bell (1999: 41-43) noted that while identifying people by role maintained anonymity for an outside reader, staff within the institution could still identify respondents. Although important to be able to identify responses for correlation and to identify any possible faculty trends, the tension between disclosure of the data and confidentiality was seriously considered. However, due to the valuable information obtained from open and honest responses, it was felt that all responses should be included in the annexures and would be transcribed as written and all grammatical and spelling errors were left unaltered in the responses. On return of the questionnaires an identifying but confidential number (paired for GA and HOD) was given to all responses. This number was used when capturing data. In order to maintain anonymity, these numbers were removed on completion of the data capture and the transcriptions of comments have been portrayed in a random order to ensure no relation can be traced between one response and another. Any references to identifiable data have been replaced by a double asterisk (**). Direct quotes in the report have been transcribed verbatim without correction of any spelling and grammar errors. Researcher inserted information has been enclosed in [square brackets].

Factual data was condensed into a summary, an example of which is shown below:

1	How long have you been a GA?	<1year = 15	1-2 yrs = 3	>2 yrs = 2
---	------------------------------	-------------	-------------	------------

This indicates that 15 GAs have been GAs for less than one year, 3 have been GAs for between 1 and 2 years and 2 have been GAs for over two years making a total of 20 responses to that question. Where comments were obtained, each response is presented in a separate cell, in a random order. The number of 'No answers' to a particular question were recorded.

The Data

Questions for data collection had been developed through the researcher's personal experiences as HOD with a GA and additional questions were found through the literature search. The study began with an initial open task set for the researchers' GA which indicated a need for a further investigation. An outline for a questionnaire was developed and completed by this GA. The response led to even further development of the questionnaire which was then given to two advisors for perusal. Their recommendations as well as further consideration by the researcher led to the final questionnaire. Because the sample was limited in size and local to TN, it was not deemed necessary to do further piloting. The questionnaire for the current GAs became the central theme and from this two other questionnaires were developed, one for HODs with current GAs, and one for past GAs now employed by the Technikon.

The questionnaires, with a covering letter, were hand delivered or sent by internal mail to the HODs and GAs, past and current. Follow up was done by the researcher by telephone and during chance encounters, and this resulted in 20 of the 22 questionnaires for both GAs and HODs being returned. This was a response rate of 91% for each of the key stakeholder questionnaires. The two GA and two HOD questionnaires which were not returned were from the same two departments. Only two of the five past GAs returned their questionnaires, however as these respondents were not identified as key stakeholders this was accepted.

The questionnaire for the current GAs was divided into 7 sections which were: Biographical details, Department Relationships, Mentorship, Staff Induction, Duties & Responsibilities, Personal Development and a concluding section. Information requested was spread between factual and opinion. The questionnaire was laid out to provide ease of completion and guide the respondent to consider specific issues, while allowing space for free comment at the end of each section. Although a long questionnaire (seven pages) a number of GAs also added extra comments on the back, and on additional paper. The responses indicated the willingness, even desire, to share information. The questionnaire for HODs with current GAs and for Past GAs Employed by the Technikon was also divided into the same sections, but the number of questions in each section were reduced. However, the resultant questionnaire still spanned five pages for each questionnaire.

Documentary evidence analysed to provide background on institutional issues included various legal Acts, national education policy, discussion documents and speeches, Technikon Natal policies and various GA contracts. Other secondary sources were used to provide background for individual issues of staff development and mentors.

Issues relating to policy, or those issues identified as needing clarification from the responses to the questionnaires, were developed into a one page mini questionnaire and delivered, with a covering note addressed to the person concerned, by hand or internal mail to ten members of management and support units. Of these ten mini questionnaires, eight responses (80%) were spontaneously returned with no follow up by the researcher. The same issues relating to confidentiality were considered during data capturing as it was important to include the information offered while not providing a "he/she said this/that" scenario.

The interviews held were semi-structured in order to allow for the individuals to express their opinions and ideas, while some questions were used as prompts. It was decided that the researcher would take notes rather than taping the interviews due to the interference taping would exert on the free flow of the information. Specific quotes and issues were recorded verbatim and clarified with the respondent during the interview. Data was analysed from the questionnaires and the documentary evidence in order to develop focal questions for the semi-structured interviews for representative key stakeholders. The information sought in the interviews was to ensure accuracy and provide a consensus of opinion.

The Samples

All HODs and GAs from the twenty-two host departments identified by the Human Resources Department formed the sample of key stakeholders. The third questionnaire was sent to the five past GAs who are now employed by the Technikon as lecturers or junior lecturers. The views and perspectives of Technikon management were sought from ten members of management including the Principal (response delegated), Vice Principal-Academic, the

Deans and one representative from each of the two support departments of Human Resources and Academic Quality Unit.

The four paired samples of GAs and HODs for interviews were allocated one pair per faculty. Both maximum variation sampling and snowball sampling methods (Marshall and Rossman, 1999: 78) were used. In two cases the Deans identified possible interviewees and in two cases the selection was made through responses by both GA and HOD which indicated an interesting feature of the programme in addition to willingness and availability. This directed sample provided data on unique issues in those departments. One past GA and one member from management were also interviewed to provide specific input.

Constraints including time and focus of the study meant many other stakeholders were intentionally excluded. These include the mentors of the GAs, the undergraduate students, other staff in the host department - academic and support, past GAs who have not been employed at TN, HODs who had past GAs who no longer participate in the programme, and more inclusive representation from management and all support departments, including those such as the Counselling department whose services could be useful.

Issues of Reliability and Validity

The case study was focused on one institution and 44 key participants and although this made the sample relatively small, the data obtained was much more extensive than would have been manageable with a bigger sample. The depth of the data provided enough scope for trends to emerge and this has benefitted the study in terms of reliability and validity. Most GAs had only been in this capacity for eight months when they responded to this questionnaire. This limited experience could have affected the quality of their responses, however the fact that so many of the responses were similar suggests that the time was sufficient for them to form a valuable impression of the task at hand.

In most cases frank responses to the questionnaires and interviews were noted. It is possible that some questions in the questionnaires were either difficult to answer...

Section 4 Question 17	Indicate how competent you are at meeting the outcomes for the teaching portfolio.
-----------------------	--

...or would be more suited to an anonymous response:-

Section 2 Question 1-3	What is your relationship with your HOD, other staff, students?
Section 4 Question 11	Have you undertaken a student evaluation of your performance?
Section 4 Question 12	Have you obtained any informal student feedback?
Section 4 Question 13	Have you undertaken a peer/staff evaluation of your performance?
Section 4 Question 14	Have you obtained any informal peer/staff feedback?

One question, identified as needing more clarification during the development of the questionnaire, became vague when space for more detail was included. Only two out of the 40 GA and HOD respondents actually commented on the confusion. Analysis of this particular question takes this into consideration.

Section 5 Question 6

What additional staff development / support factors would assist you to become a better academic? Check this list as ✓(received), X (not received), NA (not applicable), NN (not necessary).

Although these questions relate to issues of reliability, the overall analysis showed the data to provide a reliable record of the phenomenon studied, and it is likely that the uniqueness of the programme, due to being founded on a conceptual framework of institutional policy, staff development and mentoring, has no negative affect on its ability to be used in other similar institutions.

CHAPTER 4 INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The interpretation and analysis of the data has been categorised into two main sections in order to provide structure for the many issues identified in the questionnaires and supported by the literature surveyed. These sections relate firstly to institutional or macro issues relating to policy and procedures, and secondly to issues affecting the individual through staff development and mentoring. The interaction of the two sections produce the composition of the GA programme at TN.

4.1 INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES - POLICY and PROCEDURE

4.1.1 POLICY

Vision and Goals

Within management structures at TN the focus on the overall purpose of the programme seems well understood. Responses from management relating to the vision of the programme mostly focus on issues relating to equity and the development of "...a pool of potential black teaching staff". Issues relating to equity were generally not referred to by HODs or GAs. However, this seems an accepted and non-negotiable purpose, although one HOD did mention in the recommendations that the programme should be extended "...to all races." The misunderstandings relating to purpose at Technikon Natal seem most prevalent when the importance and relationship of the three underlying purposes - Qualifications, Departmental Duties and Teaching Induction - are concerned. It seems as if institutional clarification in these areas is necessary.

Management, HODs and GAs were all asked to identify "... the most important conditions of the GA contract". The management responses focused on the broader purposes of the GA programme rather than finer conditions of the contract. All responses from management indicated that obtaining a qualification was important, while most respondents also indicated a need for teaching duties to be carried out. One respondent indicated that all three areas together were important and another response generalised about "good lecturing potential" which could be taken to include all three aspects.

HODs referred to both purposes and the finer details of the contracts. With reference to purposes, HODs put more emphasis on the fulfilment of teaching and administration duties (14 of 17 responses), followed by qualifications (10 of 17) and only six respondents mentioned meeting teaching induction requirements as an important condition. Many more GAs focused their responses on the finer details of their contracts - mainly the reimbursement clause and the concern regarding future employment in the Technikon, with the length of the contract and that it is a "...kind of bursary" also featuring. Reference to purposes indicated that both qualifications and teaching duties were equally important to GAs, with only two mentioning teaching induction requirements.

Very few HODs and GAs mentioned all three purposes but the question was not specifically addressing this issue. It does however contrast with the more focused management responses. This could indicate that, for the HODs and more specifically the GAs, the main

purposes of the programme are being lost in the general clauses relating to the contracts and that communication of the vision for the programme needs clarification. A well communicated structure for the programme would reduce instances where the GA has unintentionally been allocated tasks - such as a high degree of administration work - contrary to the purpose of the programme.

Issues of Culture, Race and Gender

Darling (1992, in Nyquist and Wulff, 1994: 39) noted that due to the rapidly changing student composition including all forms of diversity becoming the norm in the USA in the early 1990's, diversity issues needed to be spoken about to create an inclusive environment. Darling suggests that assistance from the relative support units in the institution should be utilised. The changes seen at Technikon Natal have been mainly experienced with predominantly white academia and, over the last few years, a more diverse student body. The GA programme brings diversity into the academic "staff room" and issues of race, culture and gender must now be addressed openly.

The GA policy document (1999) only requires the GA to be "...black, preferably African". Equity targets other issues such as gender, disability and youth and not only race. The HODs with current GAs are predominantly white (95%) and male (60%) and the current GAs are 95% African, and 60% male. This shows at present, TN has only embraced race as part of their equity plans for the GA concept. Employment equity strategies should see an increase in participants from other target groups participating in future GA appointments. Increased access by women needs consideration in terms of mentoring, as Groomes, and Funk and Kochan (in Mullen and Lick, 1999: 79-103) identify, especially relating to women of colour during their inculcation to new institutions. Gender related communication difficulties are often caused through relatively simple misunderstandings and misinterpretations and, as with cultural issues, are often repressed because of their sensitive nature.

In 36% (8) of the current 22 departments, there is a gender match between male HOD and male GA, all from departments within the Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Commerce. There are ten departments where the HOD and GA are of different genders, mostly in departments in the Faculty of Engineering and Science, and Faculty of Health. While most GAs were self motivated, many were quite isolated from peers and noted the tension between no longer being a student but not quite being an academic. Some GAs did raise the point that they would like more contact with other GAs and this could assist in helping the GA to settle in a relatively strange environment. This aspect has been noted more amongst the younger and newer GAs, or as illustrated in Nyquist and Wulff (1996:19) still in the first "senior learner" phase of their development.

Issues relating to cultural differences were raised by both HODs and GAs. It is important to note that most differences were perceived to be beneficial to the process and that the GA programme was seen to be proactive and not patronising. One GA response noted: "I am the only black person in the department, black students also need someone to talk to about everything". An HOD commented on this aspect as well stating the GA could "...assist...individuals of second language (particularly Black students) backgrounds in terms of communication, assimilation and interpretation of syllabus work, and assisting lecturing staff".

Good communication channels between the GA and departmental staff provides an important opportunity for insight in the issues of concern to undergraduates and their conceptual frameworks. In most departments which are generally staffed by white academics with predominantly black undergraduates - this can be a highly valued tool. The GA can also communicate insight from the part of the academic staff to that of the undergraduate students - thus promoting better understanding and communication of values both up and down the ranks. In the researchers personal experience it was noted that when there is openness and trust which manifests when the GA reaches the third and most senior "junior colleague" phase as described in Nyquist and Wulff (1994: 19), shared cultural anecdotes are valuable and give insight into both Western and African cultures.

Cultural differences could manifest in behaviours such as the following expressed by HODs of their GAs: "...appears aloof...", "...only rarely comes to tea, that's where the spirit is built", "...[should be] showing more initiative". Many of these incidences could stem from cultural differences. The difficulties that face a black academic in a white institution were discussed by Sutherland (1990). Sutherland's study was based in the USA where black faculty were in the minority amongst both staff and students. Although many TN programmes now have a majority of black students, the academic staff is still predominantly white and this means many of the issues raised are pertinent to the GA programme at TN.

Sutherland (ibid) noted that the "...racial attitudes in White academe, along with the paucity of senior faculty of color...spell[s] difficulties for junior Black scholars to garner mentors." At TN it is probable in nearly all instances that a black GA will be mentored by a white academic. The need for all staff, including the GAs, to consider the role of cultural diversity must be addressed. Sutherland (ibid) also noted that frustrations caused through cultural tensions could lead junior academics to leave an academic career. Through the research at TN, instances were noted that some GAs who find the environment culturally stressful and without a support mechanism, may decide not to remain in academia. Conscious attempts to avoid or avert these possibilities must be made as it would be detrimental to the purpose of the GA programme at TN if this was to occur.

Sutherland also states that white students in particular, resist the presence of black faculty, sometimes by using nonverbal hostility. Both black and white students, through "Eurocentric consciousness" and "exposure to cultural imperialism in...higher education ...seek White faculty validation of the information presented by Black professors." Some problems experienced by GAs are possibly caused by the lack of explanation of the role and purpose of the GA programme in the undergraduate classes. In many departments the GA was not introduced formally to other staff and to undergraduates, possibly because the GA was usually a past student known in the department. The departmental induction was therefore a process of osmosis rather than careful planning.

Undergraduate concerns relating to the GA were noted by many HODs. These included comments such as:

- "Temporary problem with students ...been very well resolved"
- "...1st semester students rated him OK. 4th semester ... less than OK"
- "...major problem areas - now being addressed"
- "...some BTECH students had minor criticisms"
- "...a number of students complained...intervened...adapted to build relationships"

It must be stressed that issues relating to undergraduate acceptance of GAs are not just noted in instances of colour - Nowlis et al (1968) comment extensively on undergraduate perceptions of the teaching styles of GAs and problems and the resultant affect on the effectiveness of the GA. Nyquist and Wulff (1996:85-97) discuss the inculcation of international GAs in American institutions, most of whom are teaching in English as a nonnative language. They identify six key issues which are experienced by the GAs including clarifying assumptions about the role of the GA, differences in educational settings, differences in teaching methods, ability to understand student behaviour, teaching and communicating in English, and perceptions relating to student feedback. Support mechanisms through discussions with mentors, language classes and specific workshops are offered to assist the GAs in these areas. Many of the experiences and adjustments the GAs at TN have undergone while acclimatising themselves to their roles have been without any form of institutional support. On the positive side - most of the comments made by the HODs showed that these had been identified and in most cases solved by HODs or staff working together with the GA. This demonstrates the potential of the GA programme in terms of increasing racial understanding and tolerance.

Some GAs at TN commented with concern about the name of the programme:

"...change the name Graduate Assistants...call us Junior Lecturers so that students will understand the difference..."

"...change the name GA to Junior Lecturer because of the stigma attached to it..."

"...sometimes it makes you feel small - GA - you can't even mention it to outsiders..."

These comments are currently in the minority but must be addressed before they cause a pervasive disharmony. Through improved communication they could be changed to reflect comments such as this recorded by another GA: "...my peers respect me they see me as a role model, I now regard myself as an important person to other peoples lives".

This respect was also noted by an HOD who stated:- "...[the GA] is very highly regarded in his community and accorded high status". Although these comments have focused on the name allocated to the programme - the issues are probably deeper and reflect the communication of the purpose of the programme rather than the name. A change of name would not address the deeper issues. There has been extensive but inconclusive discussion even at Senate level as to what a "Junior Lecturer" is at TN.

One GA made a recommendation to market the programme to undergraduates. She noted that: "It's a brilliant idea. Perhaps tell students about this programme in first year, the criteria for selection and the benefits thereof". This suggestion could go a long way to paving the way for a harmonious assistantship and according the GA programme the status deserved.

Spread of GA allocation at TN.

Apartheid has resulted in an education system that up until the early 1990's was fragmented and disparately funded. Economic and social issues need redressing through new educational policy. Amongst a general need to train educators who will be able to guide the country's youth into the new technological age, the need to train educators for the science and the technologies is a national priority.

Conditions relating to the appointment of GAs are the availability of suitable candidates, the department's demographic profile and their track record with previous GA appointments.

The teaching needs of the department have also been mentioned in past contracts (Contract 1998). These conditions may need to be redefined and developed further in terms of the Technikon's vision statement and with the experience gained over the period the programme has been running.

At TN the need for "technologists" presents two main challenges for the departments offering technology orientated programmes. Firstly, there are relatively low numbers of undergraduates in these programmes due in part to a secondary school system which is critically short of Maths and Science educators and learners. Secondly, most technology based industries are critically short of well trained staff and the efforts of companies in these sectors to ensure their own employment equity plans mean attractive salaries are offered to the best students, particularly black African students. In addition, many companies offer bursary schemes to undergraduate students to encourage company loyalty. This effectively reduces the size of the potential GA pool. These two factors mean that technology based programmes are competing with their industries for the best of a particularly small base of students.

Historically, the spread of past 28 GAs (those appointed between 1995 and 1998), showed that the Faculty of Commerce was allocated eleven GAs (39%) - of which one is now employed by TN, and another one who completed a postgraduate qualification during the GA period. The Faculty of Arts had five GA appointments, two of which are now employed by TN and two who obtained their qualifications. The Faculty of Engineering and Science also had five GAs, two of which who are now employed at TN, with four of the five obtaining their qualifications. The Faculty of Health had seven GAs and although they did not offer lecturing posts to any GAs, five GAs completed their qualifications during their contracts.

The breakdown for current GA allocation per Faculty shows almost equal allocation of current GAs between the three faculties of Arts (4 GAs); Engineering and Science (5 GAs); and Health (4 GAs), with a relatively high allocation to Commerce (9 GAs). This is in part due to the relatively high student numbers in Commerce, but this allocation must be looked at in combination with the vision for the GA initiative and departmental needs. Due to the limited size of the GA programme at present it may not be an issue, but future developments may need to consider this aspect. The difference is negligible when addressing the shortage of black academics but may be necessary to be considered in terms of vision and funding.

According to the Shape and Size Report (2000) broad programme groupings include the Humanities and Social Sciences, Business and Commerce, and Science, Engineering and Technology including Health sciences. For the purposes of this study the Faculties of Arts, and Commerce, are grouped together as Humanities, and the Faculties of Engineering and Science, and Health, are grouped under Technologies. The differences between the needs and perceptions of Humanities and Technologies need to be analysed in terms of the overall purpose.

Comparison between Technologies and Humanities

This comparison between the broad groupings of the Technologies and the Humanities shows some of the variances between the needs of the two categories. The areas studied include issues relating to work experience and hours worked.

The GAs in the Technologies have in general had more prior work experience than the GAs in the Humanities. Most Technology GAs have more than twenty-four months experience whereas most Humanities GAs have less than twelve months experience. This experience must be seen in combination with the views of the HODs regarding whether the amount of work experience was sufficient. In the Technologies 78% of HODs did not think their GAs had sufficient work experience, with 55% of HODs being unsatisfied with the amount of work experience of GAs in the Humanities. This means that although GAs in the Technologies had more work experience, the HODs were still not satisfied. The graph shows the contrasts between the work experience.

One of the reasons why work experience is so important could possibly be linked to the nature of the learning content. Again generalising to some extent, many of the Humanities' programmes, especially those in Commerce, are extensively supported by textbooks and literature. Due to their nature they lend themselves to large classes where discussion is limited. Examples and case studies are provided in the textbooks. This means the pressure for a lecturer to have working experience is lessened. In most Technologies smaller classes and in some cases, fewer print based resources, put far more pressure on the academic to supply the necessary explanations and examples through the use of their experience.

Work experience and the GA position is a complex issue. Work experience is not a prerequisite for the programme, and this was confirmed by seven of the eight responses to the mini questionnaire for management. However, one response stated: "...Yes, definitely", another indicated a need for work experience before appointment to a full lecturing position, and one other added the programme could be improved "...by facilitating suitable industry experience".

Several GAs brought up issues relating to work experience. In response to being asked whether they would like to take up a lecturing position if available, five GAs indicated that they would only after they had gained industry experience. Four of these were from technology based programmes. Comments included: "this career require more / strong industrial experience" and "...love lecturing...like to work in industry so as to gain more knowledge". HODs had similar comments: "Insufficient industry experience would be a limiting factor" and "...needs to be some way of incorporating business experience into the programme." Sixty percent of GAs indicated that they had not had the opportunity to gain additional industry experience with only five percent saying it was not necessary, and another five percent saying it was not applicable.

The analysis of working hours showed many discrepancies in the perceptions of how the GAs' time was spent. There were differences between the responses from all stakeholders and between the various departments and faculties. An analysis was done of the workloads between the GAs in the Technologies in comparison to the GAs in the Humanities, and the lowest number of hours worked and the highest number of hours worked were compared. Both the low ranges and the high ranges of work were correspondingly lower in the Humanities than in the Technologies. The same trend was noticed when comparing contact periods for GAs.

The allocation of contact periods in most cases was around the recommended "approximately 12 periods" as stated in the GA contract. In general, the Technologies are on the high side, with four of the eight responses recording contact session of between 14

and 17 periods per week. Two technology type programmes recorded contact sessions of seven and eight respectively. In the humanities, of the eight responses only one HOD recorded an allocation greater than 12 periods. Two departments recorded allocations of only 4 and five periods.

The contact periods in the technologies are possibly indicating overload on the GA and in two cases the Humanities err on the low side, possibly not utilising the GA adequately, or giving them the opportunity they need to develop. The spread between doing theory or practical classes is even with about fourteen GAs in each category. Fewer GAs are involved in Tutorials. There are no major differences between the faculties regarding the differences between theory, practical or tutorial type classes.

Types of Graduate Assistants

Discussion regarding the purpose of the GA programme must include the departmental supportive roles the GA could assume. International literature identifies three main categories of GAs. The Teaching Assistant, the Research Assistant and the Administrative Assistant. The GA at Technikon Natal is currently predominantly a teaching assistant. According to Nyquist and Wulff (1996: 3) these are graduate students who "...have instructional responsibilities in which they interact with undergraduates...that range from grading tests and papers, to having office hours, to leading laboratory and discussion sections, to assuming full responsibility for a course." Boroviak (1991) includes responsibilities other than teaching such as: supervising labs, keeping office hours, performing administrative duties, performing departmental functions (ie, registration, equipment check etc), assisting the departmental head, grading objective tests, attending departmental or programme area meetings, preparation of classes, holding student conferences, tutoring students.

The other two categories of Research and Administrative GAs could be areas of investigation as the responses received in the questionnaires identified that some of the GAs at Technikon Natal do fair amounts of administration, while others have been, in the past, used mainly in a research capacity - a practice which has not been favourably entertained.

According to some GA and HOD responses, administration seems to be a major part of academia. One GA commented: "...there is confusion as to whether I should help the departmental secretary or am I assistant to lecturers only", while another remarked that: "Admin work is done by our secretary". One GA indicated spending up to eighty percent of their time doing administration, one HOD recorded using the GA for administration for 40% of the GA's time. According to the survey of management, departmental time allocated to administration should be between 5 and 10%, and this correlated with the median for HODs' responses on administration which was an allocation of 10%.

Chase (1973: 5) discusses how easily a GA can become burdened with all the jobs no-one else wants. He quotes extensively from various sources which acknowledge that "the teaching assistantship has too often been exploited as a source of cheap labor". Care must be taken to avoid exploitation of the GA, as free staffing is a tempting issue as one response indicated the purpose is "...to provide a cost effective form of person power".

Varied responses were received when respondents were asked whether they considered the

GA appointment to be a lecturer or a student. Management and support indicated three responses each for lecturer and student, and one said "Other". Of the eighteen responses from HODs, thirteen said "Lecturer", two said "Student" and three said "half and half". Twenty GAs responded and again thirteen said "Lecturer", three said "Student" and four responses said "half and half". This uncertainty needs clarification although this predicament has been identified in many international articles discussed in the Conceptual Framework.

Funding

The GA programme at TN should be as extensive as finances permit. As one HOD stated in his recommendations to improve the programme: "More GAs", would be expressed by a number of HODs. In some departments the programme is working well and those HODs expressed a desire to have more than one GA. A suggestion for a rolling programme where a new GA each year would provide continuity and further opportunity for mentoring and development, was received. It may be necessary to develop the vision and then look for the finances needed, rather than limit the vision to existing and known sources of finance.

Bouchet (1993, 341) describes how GA funding in France comes from the Ministry of Education and is based on various criteria including:- identified subject areas, the balance between requests for GA posts and openings after the contract, and the number of holders of research grants. The allocation of GAs is dependent on requests, ability to provide supervision and availability of applications. This is similar to the TN programme but offers a number of additional criteria to consider - especially funding relating to "identified subject areas" and allocation of GAs dependant on the departments "ability to provide supervision". Funding at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign (2000), comes from five sources: State Funds (25%), Tuition and Fees (20%), Government Grants and Contracts (20%), Private Gifts, Grants and Contracts and Auxiliary Enterprises and Miscellaneous. The total 2000 budget came to \$1115.4 million. While GA stipends are derived mainly from state funds and tuition income, the university allows for research assistants to be funded through research grants and administrative assistants to be paid from the operating budgets of the departments or units. This shows some of the opportunities open to TN and these areas of funding need investigation both for increasing the scope of the GA programme at TN and for GA programmes for national development.

A response by management indicated that development of young academics through high level learnership programmes is currently being investigated through the Education, Training and Development Practitioners Sector Education and Training Association (ETDP SETA). The experience gained through the GA programme at TN could be used to inform the development of these learnerships. Funding for these programmes would come from the Skills Development Levy payable by all businesses and higher education institutions. The potential for expansion and national implementation of the GA concept would be exponential.

Another issue relating to funding is the government subsidy received for registered students. As the GAs are all registered on higher qualifications, they increase the allocation of state funding for TN. However, to ensure TN receives the maximum subsidy, it is imperative to ensure the GA completes their qualification in the two years. This could be a major factor in allocating priorities to the GAs work schedule and motivating them on their studies. The GA programme at present does not have a high qualification completion rate, although some faculties have better success than others.

4.1.2 PROCEDURE

Once the vision and the purpose of the programme have been clarified, work on the actual procedures supporting the policy must continue. The current procedures provide a good framework for future development. The six years of experience learnt through the programme at TN have provided much of the structure required. Using experiences based on international literature, further development can be piloted and adapted for local conditions. The exceptional response to the data collection for this study has indicated a willing and critically reflective base of management and support departments, HODs, mentors and GAs to do the work necessary. Procedure should begin by analysing and developing the written documentation supporting the programme. This documentation includes that relating to policy, contracts, job descriptions and appraisal.

Contracts and Written Agreements

The development of the GA programme in terms of regulations has been substantial. The following information indicates how confusing the changing regulations are, especially where the terms of the contracts have changed. Knowledge of the changes is the responsibility of the individual HOD. The contract is a legal document between the Technikon, as represented by the HR department, and the GA. A major finding is that as the HOD does not automatically get a copy of their GA's contract, so many HODs do not know all the implications of the GA contract. While expected to manage the GA programme, the HOD may not know all requirements. At least two instances of errors in contracts were identified where errors have been picked up by accident at a late stage. These complications have caused unnecessary tension between GA and HOD. This was substantiated through the findings of the questionnaire. The concern remains as to whether either GA or HOD actually understands the full meaning of these legal documents. A proposal was made that at the beginning of each appointment, both the HOD and the GA are instructed simultaneously about the terms and implications of the contract.

In the USA, most universities (81%) had written contractual agreements with their GAs (Boroviak, 1991), although only just over half had a written analysis of expectations (tasks/time). TN has both written policy and contracts however the discrepancies between the two needs to be eradicated. The policy and contracts should be virtually the same, if necessary updated every year but a mechanism such as the Intranet to ensure all parties have the latest information is imperative.

Comparison of Policy and Contracts relating to the GA scholarship at TN

The contract is for a period of two years, reviewed after one year, with the second year dependent on satisfactory academic and teaching progress (GA Policy, 2000). In the Contract (1999) the Technikon's available financial provision is included in this statement, and in the Contract (1998) the teaching needs of the department were included as considerations for the second year of the contract. Each of these factors are important and should be included.

The candidate must register and study for a B Tech, M Tech or D Tech degree over the two year period (GA Policy, 2000). Twelve GAs from the total of 28 past GAs, managed to complete their degrees during the period of their GA contracts. Four completed National

Higher Diplomas and eight completed their BTechs. There were three MTech GAs and none completed their qualifications during the GA contract. Of the current GAs who responded to the questionnaire, eighteen are doing their BTech and two are doing their MTech. One HOD commented on this as "GAs should... be studying towards a Masters. BTech is not qualified ...to teach others". Given that BTechs have only been offered since 1994 and that there are relatively few graduates let alone black African graduates, this may need to remain a goal for future years while development of the lower qualification base is carried out. The minimum requirement at a Technikon for a lecturing position is currently a BTech and this supports the focus of the programme at this level. This is the main area of difference between the programme at Technikon Natal and internationally. Most GAs internationally are studying towards a Master's or Doctor's degree. This difference does not seem to have any impact on the common issues facing both the TN programme and international programmes.

From a total of 28 past GAs, only five have been employed by TN. Of these past GAs, two are appointed as "Lecturers", two are "Lecturer on contract", and one was appointed as Junior Lecturer due to an incomplete qualification. The policy states clearly that no formal employment is guaranteed after completion of the scholarship period, and then continues with the condition that, on completion of the second year the GA may be required to serve in the employ of the Technikon (under normal conditions of service) for a period of one year for each year of the scholarship. This is contradictory.

The policy then complicates the issue more by stating: "Failure to serve in the Technikons employment on request will mean the GA is required to reimburse the Technikon the value of the graduate assistantship." Similar wording but "tuition fees" and not "value of the graduate assistantship" are stated in the Contracts, 1998 and 1999 respectively. This additional reimbursement may have been unintentional but is currently in the copy of the policy. This reimbursement is also necessary if the contract is terminated after one year, or if a BTech candidate does not complete the qualification within two years - then all remitted (tuition) fees have to be paid back (GA Policy, 1999 and Contract, 1999). No mention of completing the qualification within the contract period is mentioned in the Contract (1998).

Reimbursement of fees was commented on by one GA as a condition of the contract. This may be a problem where a GA may remain in the position even if they are not happy in order to avoid this penalty. While reimbursements of investment is a standard item in most employment contracts, the implications of the penalty in addition to the consideration as to whether this would in fact ever be realised, must be considered. Linking reimbursement, and penalties for not completing the contract or the qualification, to possible job prospects leads to confusion and misunderstandings. One HOD indicated that expectations of a future job have been created and this was problematic.

The two clauses mentioned above - that of failure to take up employment on request, and the termination and completion clauses - make reading the contracts difficult. These clauses need to be revised to ensure their meaning is clear to all parties.

There is no mention of the Academic Induction requirements in the GA Policy (1999), however it appears in both Contracts (1998 and 1999). It is stated that:-

The GA must participate in a six month academic induction course comprising a one week orientation and teaching induction workshop and a series of Friday afternoon workshops. Evidence of satisfactory performance through regular student and

HOD/peer evaluation is mandatory, conducted in each semester (Contract, 1999) / year (Contract, 1998). In addition to this, the GA is expected to do courses, programmes or projects as required by HOD.

Issues relating to academic induction are discussed in the section on staff development.

Vacation leave was increased from "12 working days during academic vacation periods, plus the leave period when Technikon is officially closed" (Contract, 1998) to "Normal academic vacation leave" (Contract, 1999). This indicated a change from the GA being an administrative type appointment to an academic appointment. The implications of this may have been noted when it came to allowing GAs to take academic vacation, however it should be encouraged that this time should be used for furthering the GAs development - either through industry placement or working on qualification related matters - as indicated in Schoenfeld and Magnan (1992: 15). Eighteen GAs responded that they now take the same holidays as academics. The responses of the two GAs that stated they did not take the same holidays were verified by their HODs /Mentors. This could be due to being unaware of the changes in the policy.

The current TN GA Policy (1999) states that the duties of the GA include "...lecturing and/or tutoring and/or research of approximately 12 contact periods per week, and associated administrative duties." This has evolved from the Contract (1998) which stated that the GA would "lecture or tutor a minimum of 12 contact periods per week. Practicals would not form part of the 12 period allocation." In the Contract (1999), the wording was amended from the minimum, to the maximum, ie - "lecturing and/or conducting practicals to a maximum of 12 periods per week". There is therefore a considerable difference between the expected academic duties in the contracts of 1998 and 1999. Discrepancies in expectations could have arisen from the changes in the policy and contracts which may or may not have been communicated to the HODs. This approximate eight hours per week of lecturing time also corresponds with Boroviak's findings of between nine and ten hours.

Remuneration and Fee Waiver

The value of the scholarship in 2000 was \pm R37000pa for both BTech and MTech levels, plus Medical Aid and full remission of tuition fees. Medical Aid was not subsidised in 1998 and was amended to "partially subsidised by Council" in 1999. Investigation should be carried out to establish the starting salaries for diplomates in their respective industries. Initial studies have indicated that the starting salary of the GA varies considerably in proportion to the salary offered to new diplomates. Starting salaries vary between R1800 per month and R4000 per month for full time jobs - and employment possibilities for graduates is just as varied. The starting salary of the new GA at about R3000 per month for what is potentially a half day job, is therefore very high in some programmes. Fee waivers can add approximately another R3000 per annum, or R250 per month, on top of this package. While the initial remuneration level may provide an added attraction it could encourage students to see the GA route as a "soft option" - where students opt to apply for this position to avoid job searching while they additionally obtain a post graduate degree.

The lack of a grading system between the first and second year of the programme, and between a BTech post and an MTech post does not provide incentive for personal development. This is confirmed by one GA who stated "...the pay, probably not so good in your second year". This was also discussed during interviews by some GAs who indicated

a scaled salary would be more attractive. Differences in perceptions between the remuneration of academics is seen when contrasting the comment of one GA on the greatest rewards of an academic as being the "excellent salary" with the comment of another GA on the greatest problems facing an academic as "...loss of lecturers to industry because of pay and packages offered by industry".

Boroviak(1991), in her studies found that the total dollar value of the USA assistantships should be used as a valuable recruiting tool. These included full fee waivers by 53% of the sixty institutions surveyed. She noted that while 78% of institutions paid a uniform rate, 12% paid a differential rate for Masters and Doctoral students. Bouchet (1993) described how in France the GA was funded by a study grant with an additional monthly allowance. The University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign for 2000/01 varied their rate of pay between teaching assistants, research assistants and administrative assistants with the research assistants receiving highest remuneration.

Another factor in the setting of GA remuneration levels is that of the difference between the GA remuneration level and that of the lowest scale of the lecturer's salary scale which in 2000 was approximately R80 000 per annum. It may be beneficial to follow the recommendations of one HOD who suggested "Based on merit - the GA could be offered a one year (2?) contract lectureship...to consolidate". If this suggestion was carried through, it could be offered at the lower Junior Lecturer scale but would include a full academic load, with mentorship and support, to provide a further period of transition. A two year contract at this level may allow for the inclusion of industry work experience - an issue that concerned many HODs.

The current GAs are probably all deserving of their remuneration, as illustrated by comments from HODs and GAs themselves which indicate most are doing nearly a full day's work on top of their studies - but any future delimitations of the time spent on departmental matters may need to be analysed in conjunction with the remuneration levels and packages.

Job Descriptions

Written analysis of expectations, no matter how onerous the task, should be part of the HODs responsibility prior to the appointment of a GA. The lack of a job description has been commented on by respondents from all sectors -management, HODs and GAs. A general job description could be generated and departmental variances could be added where necessary. Use of this practice would reduce unintentional abuse of GAs. Some of the comments from the GAs relating to job descriptions included; "...need to have a clear documented programme that stipulates the exact job requirements of GA"; "...have a well defined job description not just say 'you do what other academics are doing', selfish HODs can use this to their advantage since some of us don't know what academics are supposed to do"; and that there "should be a document given to all staff members outlining the job description of a GA and clarifying exactly which instructions should you follow first, of a lecture or HOD". Management commented that "...a detailed development plan should be drawn up" and that "clearer criteria for all parties" are needed. Some HODs admitted a need for "more planning at departmental level" and a desire for a GA job description which "clarifies the duties".

Duties and Workloads

Misunderstanding and lack of clear direction regarding the workloads of the GAs has been identified as one of the main findings through this research. Workloads are dependent on two factors. Firstly the division of an average academic week into departmental time and study time and secondly the allocation of departmental time into the categories of work expected of the GA. Departmental time is the time the GA spends on teaching and mentoring undergraduates and doing related academic administration. Study time is the time allocated to the GAs personal qualification requirements - either attending classes, self study or research. The time the GA spends on staff development induction programmes would be related to departmental time, but for the purposes of this study, was discussed separately. The difficulties experienced in workload and time allocation are expressed by one respondent from management who stated "educational performance is expected to be that of a full-time student. Departmental activities are expected to be that of a full-time staff member and teaching performance is expected ... of an experienced educator".

Perceptions of workload allocation vary widely between those of management, HODs and GAs. Even within management the expectations of the time a GA should allocate to departmental duties varied between 8 hours per week and "20 hours min"; and the expected time the GA should allocate to their personal studies varied from 10 hours to 50 hours with a median of around twenty hours.

Table No 2 Comparison of Perceived Workloads by HODs and GAs(all figures in hours)

Hours	Range		Average		Median		N*	
	HOD	GA	HOD	GA	HOD	GA	HOD	GA
At Work Hours	14 - 42.5	8 - 44.5	32	34	39	39	18	20
After Hours	0 -16	0 - 46	9	15	7.5	10	18	20
Total Hours	15 - 52.5	20 - 80	39	47	42	46	18	20

The perceptions of the "at work" and "after hours" workload of the GA vary considerably depending on the perspective of the HOD or GA. The HOD perceptions of time spent at work ranged from 14 hours to 42.5 hours per week and the GA responses ranged from 8 hours to 44.5 hours per week. These figures include varying amounts of studying time and are not all allocated to departmental duties. The respondent with the lowest hours indicated in the response that "I'm not precisely [sure] just how much time do I spend on academic work since my work is mostly practical". After hours time allocations varied between nil and forty six hours. Although able to dedicate high proportions of time to one's studies in times of need, the sustainability and validity of this last figure remains questionable. This information should be used as a guide rather than an accurate measuring tool , although it is felt these figures still indicate the personal perceptions of the time allocation.

Apart from the observed discrepancy between the workload of individual GAs, there is only one case where both GA and HOD actually agree on how much work is being done in both "at work" and "after hours" categories. While most HODs in the Technologies seem to agree with the GAs on their departmental hours, the time spent on "After Hours" work is substantially underestimated by HODs in fifty percent of the cases. The total time spent by GAs in the Technologies is equal to or more than their HODs believe in seven out of eight

comparisons. Only one GA is actually doing about 50% less than the respective HOD perceives.

There is far less correlation in the Humanities although the same trend is noted whereby GAs are doing more "total" time than their HODs believe. Discrepancies of over 25% between GA and HOD perceptions of "total time" seen in five of the nine responses from the Humanities regarding departmental hours indicates a lack of understanding about what hours are expected and what hours are delivered. It is probable that the same discrepancies would present if the same survey was done amongst HODs and lecturers and this may not be an issue for concern if the work is being done to the satisfaction of all parties. However from a developmental aspect - more guidance from the HODs and interest in the GAs' workload may be beneficial.

It is possible that many HODs are unaware of the time required to perform the duties expected of their GAs. It is difficult for an experienced academic to remember what it was like to be inexperienced and therefore make adjustments in time schedules. Discussion on how the GA is coping on a regular basis, and especially in the first six months of the contract, is vital to the establishment of this communication and the necessary support. The interaction and integration of the different aspects of the GA contract - namely those of departmental duties, post-graduate studies and teaching induction requirements - needs to be balanced and checked at regular intervals. Success in this aspect is present in all departments which have experienced beneficial GA placements.

One GA commented: "I have too much work to do...usually I use nights and weekends to keep up with workload I have." The same respondent went on to say that this was experienced by all staff in the department, illustrating the norm for this department. A high work load does not necessarily mean abuse of the GA as it could have been accepted voluntarily, however moral support and discussion on coping methods and time management techniques may assist a GA to adapt more readily to maintaining a balance.

From an educational perspective, and working on the acceptance of the assumption stated by SAQA that an academic year comprises 1200 notional learning hours, and that an academic year is approximately 30 weeks long, a learner on a full time qualification should be spending approximately 40 hours a week on their studies. The GA is required to register for a part time qualification which should therefore comprise about 600 notional hours of learning per year. This means a GA should be spending a minimum of 20 hours per week for thirty weeks on their postgraduate studies.

Average academic workloads would need some discussion and this may be necessary as Higher Education moves towards performance appraisal and other business like methods of calculating remuneration. An average working week of 40 hours is mentioned in the merger documentation (TN and ML Sultan Technikon, 2000) and is a topic for national discussion. Framework discussion at the University of Cape Town (UCT) in June 2000, on the establishment of a "standard course", reveals an attempt to develop a generic job description for academics. While differences between the university and Technikon sectors remain where semester length is concerned, there are enough similarities to use this information. Discussion at UCT indicates an approximate semester workload of 56 hours per week for twelve teaching weeks with an additional three to four weeks at about forty hours per week for preparation and marking of exams. In her studies on workload norms for

Faculty, Meyer (1998: iv) indicates that the majority of faculty work between forty and fifty hours per week with between nine and twelve hours of actual teaching at 4 year colleges (ibid: 46). This is similar to the figures from the HODs and GAs.

The development of a base line on average working hours per week will assist in a number of areas - not only for the development of guidelines for the GA programme. While academic working hours vary considerably between departments, establishment of norms and guidelines will assist greatly in performance appraisal and standards setting, for both academics and GAs. Cognisance must be taken of academic freedom and integrity when establishing these guidelines. Using a forty hour week as a base line, and with the GA spending 20 hours on their studies, a minimum of 20 hours per week could be allocated to a combination of departmental duties and teaching induction during the 30 weeks of the academic year. In practice, few GAs spend a consistent 20 hours a week on their studies and in addition, the remainder of weeks between those allocated to the academic tuition time and those of the academic vacation time could be allocated to studies. Although not all academics are keeping these hours, it is important to balance the quality of the work with the need for sufficient input as indicated by Schoenfeld and Magnan (1992), Cuthbert et al (1996), Kogan et al (1994) and others. Developing staff for the future, due to financial and technological considerations, will probably mean longer hours for most academics.

Bouchet (1993) identified that French GAs take about two hours a week of first and second level under-graduate tutorials. He mentioned this equates to about one third the workload of a lecturer in a similar institution. This is contrasted with Boroviak (1991) whose findings in the USA are closer to those at Technikon Natal. She mentions that the GAs in her study were employed in their departments, on average, for twenty hours a week for nine months of the year. This study indicated that the teaching contact hours varied between nine and ten hours a week dependent on the experience of the GA. Using the information and data collected in this study shows that the allocation of what time is spent on which tasks needs urgent attention at TN.

Level and Type of Lecturing

With regard to lecturing, 55% of GAs at TN lecture alone and 25% lecture with supervision. The remainder are sometimes supervised and sometimes lecture alone. Theory type lectures and practicals were done by twelve GAs for each, with only nine of the twenty respondents doing tutorials.

At TN, seventeen of the twenty GAs lecture first year students, nine of the twenty lecture second year students and one GA is allowed to lecture third year students. One GA only lectures BTECH students. During interviews one HOD remarked that the level of lecturing for the GA was a very important decision regarding both the development of the GA and concerning the benefit of the undergraduates. A combination of using GAs for the first level subjects in addition to having other subjects lectured by full time staff was crucial. Boroviak (1991) in her study of 60 American universities noted that 56% of the respondents indicated that more than half of the basic instructional programme was being taught by GAs and 36% of respondents said that more than three-quarters of the programme was taught by GAs. One participant in that study indicated that the complete undergraduate programme was taught by GAs. At the University of Illinois (2000), GAs taught almost 30% of the total credit hours taken by undergraduates, with forty five percent of first year credit hours were taught

by GAs and 27% at second year level. This indicates that GAs at TN and internationally are predominantly used in the lower levels of the programmes. Even in 1960 this trend was noted by Berelson (in Chase, 1970:1) who stated that GAs were used, as one dean referred to them, as "intellectual dishwashers".

Ninety percent of GAs at TN prepare lectures, but only about two thirds of GAs are allowed to prepare tests or other assessment which could be due to their relatively new status as GAs. Only three quarters of the GAs at TN mark tests and other assessments, a different trend to most international experience which uses some GAs specifically to mark and grade assessments.

HODs and GAs were asked to indicate the tasks expected of the GA and to allocate a percentage of time to each task. All GA respondents and nearly all the HODs acknowledged that both teaching and studying towards the GAs own qualification were part of the contract, with 95% also involved with Preparation for Teaching (one GA inherited a teaching structure already in place). Assessment of learning was conducted by 75% and Administration was done by 70%. Three respondents said administration was not part of their contract.

The table below shows the percentage of time allocated to each task. Not all respondents allocated percentages to the tasks and some were found to have mathematical errors. The column N* refers to the number of responses who offered usable percentages. Figures have been quoted directly from responses and due to the "difficult[y] to quantify these activities" as mentioned by one HOD, may contain allocation errors. Another HOD admitted that this was guesswork, however the general perception of how time is spent is important. Because of differences in duty allocation between departments, the averages do not add up to 100%, but the results give some indication of the time allocation of the duties of the GAs. Comparisons of individual schedules will provide guidelines for investigation or verification if large discrepancies are seen.

Table No 3 Percentage of time allocated to tasks - Comparison HOD and GA perceptions

Task	Range		Average		Median		N*	
	HOD	GA	HOD	GA	HOD	GA	HOD	GA
Studying (own qualification)	15 - 50	10 - 50	39	29	40	20	12	9
Teaching	8 - 40	10 - 40	21	23	20	20	13	9
Preparation for teaching	5 - 20	3 - 30	13	15	10	15	11	9
Assessment of learning	2 - 10	2 - 15	8	7	9.5	5	8	6
Mentoring students	3 - 40	5 - 15	12	9	10	10	12	9
Administrative work	2 - 40	3 - 30	12	12	10	10	11	8

According to the GAs, analysis of the table shows an average of 29% of the time spent in the department is allocated to the GAs own studies, and an average of 23% allocated to teaching. Teaching preparation and assessment make up another 22%. Time spent on mentoring students and administration is similar at around 10-12%. Overall, the GAs responses are very similar to the responses by the HODs with the biggest difference coming from the area of the average time allocated to personal studies.

Summarising this information, it can be seen that between about 40% (HOD response) and 30%(GA response) of the GA's time during working hours is spent on their qualifications, about 45% on teaching related issues and about 24% on administration and mentoring undergraduates. Management figures indicated this allocation should be about 50% on studies and the balance being split between teaching and other departmental duties (mentoring, administration and other).

Recruitment and Admission Criteria

According to the GA Policy document (1999) the procedure to be followed is:

Advertisements for GAs are aimed at senior African students and it is normally necessary for the HOD to actively canvass for applications, due to the greater financial attraction of working in industry for prospective candidates. Because of the relatively short and temporary nature of the contract, and that the applicants are known to the department, it is not considered necessary to over-formalise the procedure. The procedure is that the applicant/s are interviewed by the department, who will recommend them for appointment if considered suitable. The Dean will approve the recommendation in consultation with the Vice-Principal: Academic and it will be forwarded to Human Resources for processing.

The GA posts are apportioned according to availability of suitable candidates and the Technikon's academic equity policy. The department's demographic profile, and track record with previous GA appointments if appropriate, is also considered.

Recruitment by the HOD is problematic using these guidelines. A candidate cannot be offered a position until they have been identified and recommended, but there is no guarantee of an appointment until Human Resources has affected the contractual agreements. This has been seen to present difficulties as one GA started late as she had "been called to start late by HR" and another HOD recommended that appointments be made in the previous year to ensure that at the start of the year everything is in place to avoid disruption to planning. It would be better for the department to motivate for a GA post using criteria agreed on by policy, preferably including an outline of a job description or development plan. With the post allocated in principle, recruitment against specific objectives can be done. A wider net than just the senior students at TN could increase the chances of obtaining applicants with work experience although this is not identified by most management responses as a prerequisite for the programme. One HOD commented she had not even applied for a GA when she was advised that a GA had been appointed for her department. This GA had applied directly to the faculty and as expected, arrangements to accommodate the GA were hasty. This practice should not have occurred, and although in this case everything worked out very well, other appointments of this nature could be disastrous.

The GA must meet the minimum requirements for the post which is a completed National Diploma and eligibility to register for BTech, MTech or DTech degree. Studies in the USA by Boroviak (1991) describes the most important admission criteria is the potential for successful admission to the university postgraduate programme. This indicates the student should be able to earn admission to the proposed qualification level academically without a proposed GA position influencing the decision in any way. All sixty departments from institutions in Boroviak's study indicated this as the most important criteria. Boroviak (1991)

identified that professional recommendations were required in 92% of cases, and just over half the universities also ran interviews. Appointments for research assistants in almost 20% of responses required research experience but only 8% of teaching assistants were required to have teaching experience. Some respondents also ran other tests namely the Miller Analogy Test (MAT) and the Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT). The availability of these tests may have value for TN.

While the GA programme at TN is still relatively small, a simple selection procedure has sufficed. This is now developing into an issue needing attention. HOD concerns and recommendations include: "currently there is a reasonable demand from students to become GAs in this department. Selection and placement could become problematic" and a need for "careful selection - we used special funds to pay psychologists to help us select the best candidate". While these measures are no guarantee of success, they do provide further information that could assist in developing a GA. As the programme becomes more developed employment and appointment legislation issues may well become more important. This issue therefore needs attention.

Academic Literacy and Language

The importance of English language proficiency and academic literacy are matters under discussion regarding undergraduates and entry requirements. The issues need to be discussed at Postgraduate level as well - especially with regard to the GAs who will be guiding undergraduates and, more specifically, the lower level undergraduates in their studies. All responses from management stated that English competency is a prerequisite for the GA appointment, but nothing has been stated in the policy documentation as yet. If the Technikon is testing all undergraduates for language proficiency it may need to begin to test all post-graduates as well.

The determination of the point at which language difficulties begin to impede academic progression has still to be identified as there are a number of other variables in this discussion. Written responses to the questionnaires and verbal interviews indicate that language issues are present with regard to GAs. This problem is not unique to TN and should not be seen to be related to the affirmative action policy. Oppenheim (1997) comments that typical civil law suits regarding International Teaching Assistants (ITAs) includes claims that the institution failed to provide undergraduate students with adequate instruction, or when the prospective or employed ITA claims they were a victim of discrimination. Oppenheim provides a table of twenty two American State Statutes and Regulations governing English Proficiency for ITAs. While the USA is far more litigious than South Africa, knowledge of these potential issues provides adequate time to implement measures to avoid their occurrence. The NC State University (2000) , describes their policy regarding language testing as the norm for all their ITAs. The ITA Policy states that:

"...all ITAs who are to have significant verbal interaction with students in the classroom or laboratory must be screened for English proficiency before they are permitted to assume these responsibilities for the first time. If the screening process indicates that an ITA needs to improve his/her spoken English significantly in order to communicate effectively with the students at the level required for full or partial teaching responsibilities, he/she will be required to take appropriate English as a Foreign language (FLE) course(s) and be rescreened before assuming those responsibilities".

The screen is performed four times per year. Proficiency in English is evaluated at NC State University by means of the Spoken Proficiency English Assessment Kit (SPEAK) test.

Kathy Masters (1988) in her paper "Illiteracy: a problem for the Humanities" mentions that by 2000 most new jobs will need a post secondary education. She continues by stating that many students will continue to enter college with only limited literacy skills. One potential way to help students with limited literacy skills is to employ GAs to work with small groups. One GA noted that some of the problems facing academics are related to "diversity and language proficiency problems. The quality of students we admit". Using the GAs to assist undergraduates in subject and language related issues could assist in reducing misunderstanding if the GA has sufficient grounding in these areas first.

Language is only part of the problem, as academic literacy is also a pertinent issue. Seventy three percent of GAs indicated they had not received assistance with academic writing skills, and fifty percent said they had not received assistance with research skills. This factor is probably even more important than English proficiency as these are the country's post-graduate students. Interestingly the GAs expressed a higher need for these skills than the HODs identified. One GA commented "I am desperate for this..." in relation to research skills.

Departments will need to identify what degree of proficiency is necessary in language, academic writing and research skills and ensure the GA obtains the necessary support.

Handbooks

The need for documentation to support the programme has been identified by all parties, and this could be contained in a handbook would combine of all the documentation discussed above. It could be devised to contain both institutional and departmental information as suggested by Boroviak(1991). Boroviak (1991) stated that while 60% of departments made their handbooks available to the GAs, only about a third of universities had available handbooks. The figures for colleges were substantially lower.

Examples of the material to be contained in a handbook has been discussed in many international forums. Minkel and Richards (1980) developed a model based on surveyed employment conditions during 1980 for GAs at 56 major institutions in all 50 states. Implementation varied according to the nature, tradition, and needs of the institutions. The model gives the philosophy of graduate assistantships, types, qualifications for appointment, appointment procedures, levels of employment, conditions of service, privileges, rights, responsibilities evaluation and reappointment. Darling and Earhart (1990) mention the value of a handbook including teaching related matters in addition to institutional matters. Examples of American handbooks, such as those from the University of Maryland (2000) and NC State University (2000) are easily available from the Internet and could provide a framework for the development of a TN specific handbook.

The handbook would be a vital document bringing all policy and procedural matters to one point. It would be easily updated annually and could be used to track the development of the GA programme for further studies. Having a new handbook every year would alleviate the problem of out-of-date information and would be a common point of reference for management, support departments, HODs, mentors, staff and GAs themselves. Access to the handbook through the library would inform undergraduates of the goals of the programmes.

4.2 INDIVIDUAL ISSUES - STAFF DEVELOPMENT and MENTORSHIP

4.2.1 STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

Although most GA staff development programs focus on teaching issues, additional assistance is often necessary - especially with consideration to the particular developmental nature of the GA programme and the personal growth of the GA. The interviews in particular indicated a need for three main areas of support for GA related staff development programmes. These could be categorised as teaching support, academic support and personal development programmes. Some comments received in interviews noted that these were needed by all academics, not only GAs. At TN the only institutional wide support offered to GAs was that of the teaching induction programme and any additional requirements needed to be attended to by the individual departments.

Boroviak (1991) found that in the majority of cases in the USA, responsibility for orientation at universities was located in the department hosting the GA, although just over half the respondents indicated the orientation was provided both institutionally and departmentally. Brown-Wright et al (1997), in their research found GAs have a preference for departmental programmes over institutional ones and more specifically that GAs preferred peer training. This was agreed to by some GAs at TN during interviews. The need for closer cooperation and communication between the Academic Quality Unit and the HODs was commented on in interviews, the mini questionnaire and the questionnaires for HODs and GAs.

The Academic Staff Development programme at TN currently consists of three main areas - the one week orientation, the fifteen week induction course and the compilation of a teaching portfolio. The study conducted by Brown-Wright et al (1997) in their comparison between faculty and GAs identified that both faculty and GAs mentioned training in teaching strategies and related techniques as being the most important training need. Most GAs at TN had completed, or were busy with, the induction programme at the time of the questionnaire and 80% of GAs said they had received assistance to develop teaching skills. Although 65% also stated they had received coaching in how to deal with students, due to the nature of the GA programme, this area would probably need more attention than other new lecturers would need.

Orientation

Because most (80%) of the current GAs studied at TN as undergraduates, their orientation needs would be different to those of new staff. Cognisance needs to be taken of their changed status from student to "quasi-academic". Orientation needs to make clear the differences between the institution from a lecturer's perspective and that from a student's perspective. There is the strong possibility that some GAs do not get the full benefit from the orientation programme because of their familiarity with the Technikon. They presume because they know the campus they have little to learn. This was seen in two responses which indicated some GAs perceived that they had not gained much support from the orientation week: "Not much I had already been to the Tech for 3 years"; "Not really coz I'm already very familiar with Tech".

Responses to orientation showed that 60% of GAs acknowledged that the orientation week assisted in identification with the Technikon. Specific positive comments included "...I've learnt things I wouldn't even bother to know if I was still a student"; "Most definitely, otherwise I don't think I would survive"; "...it made things much more clearer as what is expected & required". Orientation assisted GAs to get to know the workings of the Technikon: "I know what people are doing and where I can get help from"; and assisted in the communication of the "...goals of my department and of the institution". Other comments regarding the success of orientation week were more neutral: "Not that much from what I all-ready knew since I've been here from 97"; "...we only went to the library otherwise it was theory, theory, theory"; "In my department, yes. But in other sections, it seems something was lacking". Brown-Wright et al (1997), recorded responses from USA GAs such as "initial orientation good idea"; "follow-up orientation need to be scheduled evenings and Saturdays"; and "faculty need to talk with each new GA and describe what their goals and expectations are".

Teaching Induction

Interviews with GAs and HODs indicated that separating GAs from new lecturers in the induction programme should be considered. It was mentioned that GAs sometimes felt intimidated by more confident and experienced new staff, particularly when it came to presenting work to the group. Dividing the two groups would mean more work but possibly, the GAs do not need all the theory which new lecturers need. There are also other areas in which the GAs need more time than that required by other experienced staff.

The comments by the GAs regarding the most beneficial part of the induction process focused on learning teaching skills. "Learning how to handle students and setting assignments"; "Teaching & learning seminars"; "Learning about OBE, copywriting, different teaching styles etc"; "Staff induction was very helpful to me...used to wonder why people use different lecturing techniques... why students lose concentration... I now know the do's and don'ts of lecturing" were among comments received. The sense of "shared experiences"; "been part of the group and having a sense of shared anxiety"; "support system for staff who have little or no academic background in terms of lecturing"; and "this is where I felt I was not alone and sharing views and ideas made my life easy" showed the moral support most GAs got from the programme. Most GAs commented this was the only place they met other GAs. Although beneficial that this happened, it was limited to networking between the newer GAs only, and did not allow for the inclusion of more senior GAs. Most GAs interviewed felt they would be able to assist new GAs to adjust to the technikon. The opportunity for peer mentoring should be encouraged. Comments regarding the least beneficial part of the induction process mentioned three issues, namely having to do the theories of learning, OBE and one comment regarding: "The time slot of Friday afternoon!".

Specific comments from HODs in both interviews and through the questionnaires showed that they wanted more input in the teaching induction: "A module of teaching...based on departmental programme work...should be included...part of evaluation and method of guidance"; "A valuable exercise - too much unnecessary theory"; and "Grandiose ideas on teaching & learning strategies...may work for the Arts...not suitable for Science...seem to push tutorial / group discussions as a good way of facilitating learning...if the student knows nothing, old fashioned lecturing must precede other methods". One HOD commented positively on the improvements made to the induction programme: "This years programme seems to prepare the GA better and give them a good grounding for lecturing".

Teaching Portfolios

Comparison of the responses by the HOD and the GA regarding the GAs progress in compiling the teaching portfolio indicated that seven GAs stated they have yet to start their portfolios while their HODs believe these portfolios to be work-in-progress. Of the eighteen GAs who have completed or are currently busy with their induction, only ten say they have started their portfolios. No GA has yet submitted a teaching portfolio. Interviews confirmed that the compilation of the portfolio is presenting difficulties for most GAs. The portfolio is a new addition to the induction programme for 2000, and while it follows the new trends in assessment, there is a lack of understanding about what it should consist of. None of the GAs interviewed had ever seen a portfolio and while they were prepared to try to compile one, most were not sure they had the time available. An investigation needs to be done to see whether this portfolio would be necessary for the GAs to complete. It is possible that along with all their other tasks, this may be a "nice-to-have". Should the GA be appointed to a lecturing position, it may be of greater value to complete the portfolio then, when the lecturer is fully involved in teaching.

The questionnaires for the GAs also asked questions relating to teaching practice in general. The following items were included: Quality Assurance, teaching methods and assessment, Outcomes Based Education (OBE), evaluation and feedback, appraisal, rewards and problems facing academics and competency in meeting teaching outcomes.

Quality Assurance

The item in the questionnaire on Quality Assurance in Teaching seemed to perplex most GAs. This could have been caused by misunderstanding the wording or could indicate a need for a more focused section in the staff induction programme, although this seems to be accommodated according to the programme. Due to the international focus on quality assurance in higher education, all GAs should be able to talk about quality. Ten GAs never answered the question, although one response stated: "I can't remember terminology like that but if it means constantly been aware and revamping and examining our teaching practise to ensure it has the highest for the students then I learned TN vision for ensuring quality". Two responses showed insight on the part of the GA: "the quality of what we teach is important and must also be recognised internationally" and "Quality...can be assessed by the number of employable or self employed students produced by the programme...demand of programmes offered by the Technikon in the industrial world. Quality of a lecturer's work - assessed by the level of improvements by the students, also feedback from students (tests, assignments, practicals, tutorials etc), staff assessment & student as well as self evaluation."

Teaching Methods and Assessment

Teaching is where most GAs would spend all their time if allowed - to the detriment of the completion of their own qualifications. The positive way in which the GAs at TN have adapted to the teaching side of their contracts is similar to that of international experience. Due to the enjoyment most GAs get from this activity, when asked about teaching methods, most GAs gave considered explanations. In analysis, 60% of GAs liked to facilitate group work. Discussion was favoured by 45% of GAs followed closely by demonstrations (40%) and lectures (35%). Some of the other methods mentioned were tutorials and factory visits, with four GAs indicating that they used all methods. What is inspiring is that nobody

indicated a preference for only one method. Many comments indicated a wide use of different teaching methods, showing versatility and ability to adapt to the learning material and outcomes. The desire to try new methods is apparent with many GAs and reports of how in some departments, the GAs are driving the changes towards OBE indicate how well the programme works. These are some of the beneficial spin offs from the GA programme. Nyquist and Wulff (1996: 46-65) discuss strategies to prepare GAs for these various roles. Many of the ideas they suggest would benefit the GA at TN.

Nyquist and Wulff (1996: 65-67) continue to discuss the process of evaluation and some of the problems relating to assessment such as fairness, policy, consistency and preparation. Although assessment is the smallest part of most GAs teaching related duties, the preferred type of student performance assessment methods indicated GAs are trying new methods, but maybe with less confidence than they approach the teaching aspect, although one student commented: "I prefer a range...this gives a more holistic picture." One GA mentioned an outcomes based approach, and others alluded to less traditional approach to assessment including using different assessors and continuous assesment.

Amongst the methods commented on were:-

- * Peer assessment - especially for group work: "the best 'cause they are the ones who know the contribution of each member to the group work".
- * Continuous Assessment - to use an outcomes approach: "prefer continuous assessment...year end exams allow for route learning which does not reflect what the student knows and can do"; and because "loop holes can be identified early and remedied".
- * Assignments - GA comments related to extending the student past the lecturers body of information: "they give students a chance to find out more about the topics thus helping them even more than you will give them"; and "students research information and read more...lecturer to ... give references...allows for students to be responsible...to gather as much info as they can without being limited by what the lecturer knows, does not depend on lecturers knowledge".
- * Tests and excercises - the value of written tests was noted as: "even though it is difficult to mark and time consuming, test can show / tell who understands well ...also pick up things they didn't understand from failing certain sections of the test"; "because you are sure that the student has done it by him/her self" and "you can see if the students did understand the work or not".
- * Role play, and Oral presentation - the use of these methods to reduce problems relating to written communication were noted: "it is easy to communicate ideas...it serves time...minimize errors (spelling), some handwritings are hard to read...it allows for clarification of points".

Understanding of Outcomes Based Education

GA understanding about Outcomes Based Education varied considerably. This concept is proving challenging for many academics and it is inspiring to see the young GAs grappling with the issues. Only three GAs indicated a scant knowledge of OBE, with one GA not answering the question. Other comments provided more insight, if not always generally accepted definitions. These included: "new system of learning & teaching that emphasise that student be told beforehand assessment criteria and methods to assess them"; "making sure that a student is capable of doing something after completing first year, then second

year, & third year"; "the actual demonstration in an authentic context"; "OBE allows students to be actively engaged in their learning...preparing them to meet the demands of industry"; "learners should at the end of the learning event be able to say the outcomes were achieved" and lastly "learning everyday in the real life context".

On being asked how well OBE is incorporated into their department, five GAs were either unsure or did not answer the question. Most answered in a conservatively positive manner. Comments were: "I would say the progress grows on the daily basis because each and every day in the department there are some outcomes that are being met by the students"; "Everyone is in support of OBE"; "The department is trying its best"; "Our department is in the process of implementing OBE, its not easy but I can see it working and I have noticed a change of attitude from students, they also seem to enjoy it"; "It has been initiated"; "We have just started with the OBE programme". Other GAs displayed a more confident approach to OBE implementation: "Very well but the concept is new so there is still that uncertainty especially with the media debates going on, but my colleagues are well-informed"; "Very well. We've been offering outcome programmes for about \pm 3 yrs"; and "I would say very well". However, some responses indicated a very superficial understanding of OBE implementation: "the dept is busy with modularisation. I can say OBE is well incorporated into my dept"; "It is well co-operated because continuous assessment is done".

A problem with the introduction of OBE in the induction programme was commented on by several GAs during interviews, especially those in departments which were not working with the Academic Quality Unit on OBE pilot programmes. GAs mentioned that they had difficulty sharing ideas they were exposed to because their junior status in the department prevented them from discussing these ideas with other staff. One GA queried: "What can I teach the more experienced staff?", indicating both the underlying issues relating to status and communication in the department, and potentially a caution be aware that the GA should not be used to try to convert a department. Fullerton (1998) in her discussion on mentoring GAs points out that meetings with GAs must not stray into areas of departmental politics.

Evaluation and Feedback

This is an area where substantial improvement could increase effectiveness of the programme. Four questions relating to evaluation and feedback from both students and staff were asked of both GAs and HODs. In general, the responses received by GAs and HODs showed similarity. The only question where a significant difference was seen was regarding informal peer / staff feedback to the HODs. This indicates that while most HODs have received informal feedback, they may not have yet passed it on to their GA.

The responses are summarised below.

Table No 4 Comparison HOD and GA Perception of Evaluation and Feedback

	GAs		HODs	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Have you undertaken a student evaluation of your performance?	8	12	10	8
Have you obtained any informal student feedback?	13	7	13	7
Have you undertaken a peer/staff evaluation of your performance?	9	11	8	12
Have you obtained any informal peer/staff feedback?	11	9	17	3

The low percentage of formal evaluations gives some cause for concern, with the informal feedback only slightly higher. This indicates the GA evaluations, formally and informally, seem to be an ad hoc arrangement. This could be attributed in part to a lack of an accepted standardised system in addition to the fact that many of the GAs, at the time of the questionnaire, only had eight months experience. While general discussions as to the suitability and use of the standard computerised test seem ongoing, one GA took the initiative and "made students to write on a piece of paper what they learnt and what they would like to do to improve". Standard, user friendly, appraisal systems need to be developed with some urgency, however this is a matter for general staff appraisal and not only related to GAs.

Where evaluation and feedback were done, the GAs seem to have been able to use the results to develop themselves. Comments such as "came to understand the areas where I need to improve my teaching skills"; "first one gave favourable results...second one was very negative, resolutions were made and I am implementing own strategy". Another GA commented on an evaluation which had been done but with no feedback: "it was done by the HOD, I don't know what students said about me". Another used the results for affirmation "Very happy about the outcome, there was one thing... otherwise good". Specific comments on informal student feedback resulted in further understanding by the some GAs: "acknowledging my flexibility and changes in the approach"; "some students brought to my attention things I thought they were not important" and "students comments were informative & helpful in terms of my teaching style".

When asked "Have you undertaken a peer/staff evaluation of your performance?", most GAs concentrated on assessment of teaching skills and presentations, often only those done for the teaching induction programme, and not in the department in front of students. One department, who engaged the GA in team teaching used a "little black book" in which all comments relating to lecturers were recorded, both from the GA who commented on the more experienced staff member, and vice versa. Paired teaching programmes were seen in a number of departments, especially in regard to new GAs, and showed good results with GA development.

HODs were also generally positive about the results of the evaluation process where it had been done. Only one response made reference to the computerised assessment, and this was only to say "we haven't had the computerised feedback". There was a general reluctance to discuss specifics and this could be due to the traceable nature of the questionnaire. The HODs who had identified problem areas all indicated they had made arrangements to address these problems.

Formal peer evaluation seems even more difficult. There are currently documents being tested for use in this area but they are not widely used yet. One HOD stated: "I initiated it, not the GA. This has happened a number of times. He is good in areas, but seems to lack insight in areas that need improvement." One comment by a HOD referred again to communication issues: "few difficulties - mainly insufficient communication". Other comments such as "personal relationship a bit strained" and "Shortcomings have been pointed out...made suggestions for improvement... which he is implementing", show that there are areas to be developed. HODs showed they had looked at the GAs performance holistically, trying to assess development in all areas.

Informal peer or staff feedback seems to be more forthcoming from the HODs. It is obvious that there is discussion happening in many departments regarding the development of the GA. Examples of the comments include: "...staff feels that he do have the abilities to be a successful lecturer. He is always willing to help or assist when needed"; "...small staff, co-operation and overlap of practical subjects - create close interpersonal contact and feedback"; "Staff and students comment very highly on... ability to lecture and to discipline the students"; "...a good teacher, participates in all the department does outside of normal duty. Very competent and able to take pressure". Growth by the GA is noted as one HOD said: "...did struggle a little in the beginning of the year, but has improved significantly during the year" and another commented "...student reflection processes show good & mature decisions made".

Appraisal

There was no specific question in the questionnaires regarding appraisal and only one GA commented "My HOD was satisfied with my performance level as a GA" which illustrated the more encompassing appraisal necessary for performance of the GA. This was identified as an area for improvement while analysing the responses to the questionnaires and a question was included in both the mini questionnaire and in the interviews. HODs are required to produce appraisals of the GAs' performance at the end of the first year of the GA contract in order for the contract to be renewed. In the Contract (1999) this is written as: "Successful assessment of teaching performance...academic record".

Responses from management indicate this appraisal is at best "Adequate", with the development of a system dependent on the HOD and department. Most HODs are unable to allocate sufficient time to the development of such a system, and a departmental approach would result in too many variances in reporting methods. Good systems (from "model" departments in this regard) could be identified and developed for all HODs to use. The research indicated that different faculties and departments have different reporting requirements, varying from a detailed report by the HOD countersigned by the GA in addition to a written submission by the GA, to a brief memo from the HOD with no discussion with the GA. In most cases - it seems as if the content of these appraisals are not communicated to the GA.

One response from the mini questionnaire commented on GA appraisal as being "...mainly conducted for summative bureaucratic purposes...not approached as an ongoing developmental exercise...evaluated on their educational performance, departmental activities and teaching performance against standards that are not specifically designed for teaching assistants...unfair particularly where it takes place in an unsupportive context". Boroviak (1991) also identified the difficulties pertaining to appraisal due to the multiple task nature of the assistantships, and she implied a need to evaluate the workload as it relates to quality of performance. She noted that written expectations of tasks and time allocations would assist in this regard. Certainly for TN, the setting up of a more uniform, more formal and more frequent appraisal system could improve the performance of the GA.

Rewards and Problems

When asked what the greatest rewards for and greatest problems facing an academic were, GAs gave the following responses. These responses come after only limited exposure as most GAs have less than one year's experience in academia. Rewards identified were grouped into various categories such as those relating to personal learning (5 responses), teaching and developing others (7 responses) and also more economical rewards (6 responses). These were noted as being the flexibility of working hours, having spare time during the day, an "...excellent salary, a good image, a role model to your community...", to be "...updated economically" and issues relating to promotion and motivation. That two GAs did not respond to this question, is a point of concern - the question raised is "Do they not see any rewards to being an academic?"

Problems related mainly to difficulties with students (6 responses), industry issues (2 responses), doubt about personal capability (3 responses) and workload (5 responses). Two GAs indicated they thought issues relating to OBE were problematic and another two indicated concerns about the merger between TN and ML Sultan Technikon.

Teaching Outcomes

The development of the teaching induction programme and the requirement that GAs meet the following outcomes and develop a Teaching Portfolio are new for 2000. This portfolio is supposed to be submitted and declared complete (ie the composer of the portfolio would have provided sufficient evidence to be declared competent in all of these outcomes) before the end of the two year GA scholarship period.

The table below shows the differences in the perceived competencies. The numbers indicated in the table show the GA's self assessment of competency compared to the assessment of the HODs. The assessments may be skewed due to the inclusion of names on the responses. Not all GAs and HODs answered all outcomes therefore figures do not always tally.

Analysis of the table shows that on average, both HODs and GAs rate most GAs "almost competent" in designing a teaching programme; using a wide range of teaching and learning strategies; evaluating work with a range of self, peer and student monitoring; and reflecting on own personal and professional practice and making a plan for continuing professional development. On average, both HODs and GAs rate most GAs "competent" in providing support to students in academic and pastoral matters; and using a wide range of assessment methods. The division between those GAs rated "competent" or "almost competent" is much closer for the following outcomes: performing effectively in teaching support and administrative matters; developing professional and personal coping strategies; gaining an appreciation of the particular educational concerns of your discipline; and Identifying and meeting departmental outcomes.

One GA commented that induction staff development should "only deal with the above ten topics (outcomes) in detail so that we are able to meet all these requirements". The need to produce a portfolio was discussed earlier, but it can be seen that competency in most of the above outcomes can be demonstrated in other ways.

Table No 5 Perceived Competency in Meeting the Outcomes for the Teaching Portfolio

		Competent		Almost competent		Not competent	
		HOD	GA	HOD	GA	HOD	GA
1	Designing a teaching programme	3	5	11	11	3	4
2	Using a wide range of teaching and learning strategies	5	9	11	9	2	2
3	Providing support to students in academic and pastoral matters	11	13	6	6	2	1
4	Using a wide range of assessment methods	4	6	11	12	3	2
5	Evaluating work with a range of self, peer and student monitoring	2	5	12	14	2	1
6	Performing effectively in teaching support and administrative matters	9	9	6	9	3	2
7	Developing professional and personal coping strategies	7	9	7	8	3	1
8	Gaining an appreciation of the particular educational concerns of your discipline	6	8	12	7		3
9	Reflecting on own personal and professional practice and making a plan for continuing professional development	6	7	9	11	2	1
10	Identifying and meeting departmental outcomes	8	12	9	8		

One advantageous issue regarding the completion of the portfolio is that should the GA not become a lecturer, they would have an excellent portfolio to show other potential employees their capabilities. Possibilities of the new induction course being registered on the National Qualifications Framework as a credit bearing qualification will have additional implications.

Additional Staff Development Needs

As noted in the introduction to this section, although most staff development programs focus on teaching issues, additional assistance is often necessary to ensure the personal growth of the GA. Brown-Wright et al (1997) in their comparison between faculty and GAs identified other training needs such as research writing, office politics, job stress, sensitivity/diversity training and additional computer training in the areas of Internet, spreadsheets and graphics. The three main areas of support for GA related staff development programmes at TN could be categorised as teaching support, academic support and personal development programmes. While teaching support has been addressed, the other two identified areas of support need attention.

Including the TN support units from the library; Education Development Centre; and Counselling Unit would provide a far more extensive and valuable support programme for the GAs. One GA was unaware of the different programmes, which would have been of value to her, offered by the Counselling Unit, and in fact was unaware of the existence of the

Counselling Unit. It must be noted that recent developments stimulated by the Skills Development Act have seen more support courses being offered to all staff. These include Team Building, Time Management and basic computer skills. Identification of the main areas needed by GAs could lead to a programme developed specifically for their needs. Courses for HODs and mentors of GAs should be included in the development of such a programme. Brown-Wright et al (1997) and Fullerton (1998) mentioned that training opportunities for the individuals to whom GAs are assigned should be introduced in an effort to reduce potential tension and conflict between the two parties. Should this aspect be considered by TN, time constraints would be a major factor however, given the degree of enthusiasm and commitment among the HODs who responded to the questionnaire, this may be overcome in some way.

When asked "What additional staff development / support factors would assist your GA/ you to become a better academic?" many HODs commented that in general: "...all of this should be covered in the programmes". Unfortunately, as discussed in issues of validity and reliability, asking for clarification as to whether the factors in the given list had been received or not received, were not applicable or not needed, produced invalid data between the identification of the need for the factor, and whether the GA had received assistance in the specific instance. Some HODs got over the confusion by comments such as "...don't know if he has received but does need". Many of these issues were repeated during interviews. Other staff development and support issues were: coaching in cultural sensitivity; stress; computer skills and opportunities to gain industry experience and talk to other GAs. Coaching in time management and communication skills were indicated by many HODs as still being necessary even though this had been provided. Additional comments such as the GA needing "...assistance with setting priorities" and other comments in the questionnaire responses indicated this.

The area of academic support in writing and research skills was noted by GAs as being an important area for development. One GA commented: "I am desperate for this [research skills]". Research Methodology skills are often covered in the degree programme for which the GA is registered but are possibly inadequate to meet the purpose. The content and level of research classes was identified as a possible concern. Most GAs have had limited exposure to the terminology and concepts during their undergraduate programmes, and dealing with these issues requires a completely new framework of reference to be developed. This process cannot be rushed and must be sensitively handled. Research methodology has been a difficult concept to impart to students from more advantaged and better prepared backgrounds for many years. The tenacity of the GAs and other postgraduate students in the face of these difficulties is to be admired, but more support and consideration should be given to these issues, as with in the undergraduate programmes, academics grapple with issues on how best to impart knowledge. It cannot be said that these students, having completed an undergraduate qualification, are sufficiently equipped to deal with postgraduate qualifications. This is especially noted in relation to academic writing skills, which can only be developed over time and with practice and constant feedback. The fact that many of our GAs have language hurdles to cross compounds the problem, although it is accepted that some postgraduate programmes have a lesser need for strong academic writing skills. Responses to the questionnaires indicated that ten GAs had not received assistance with research skills, although only five HODs said this had not been offered. No responses indicated research skills were not applicable or not necessary. Fourteen GAs indicated not receiving coaching in academic writing skills with only four indicating they had received some

coaching. Only one GA said that they did not need this assistance. Interviews indicated that more coaching in using the library would be advantageous.

Research skills and academic writing skills were noted in Brown-Wright et al (1997) by Delworth and Hanson (1990) as showing that "real comfort with and appreciation for research are acquired only through systematic involvement in relevant research projects with faculty over a period of time. Development of academic writing skills is critical to the research process". In their final analysis, Brown-Wright et al (1997) indicated that although GAs did not rate highly their need for research training, this would assist them to become more acculturated in the academic setting.

Although more could be done in this respect, growth and personal development has occurred with all GAs which has been identified from both the GAs and the HODs. Comments from GAs include: "can withstand pressure, be responsible, make wise decisions"; "enhance[d] and develop[ed] skills...that I was not aware of and gained confidence in myself"; "feel better equipped to face the world...a chance to go attend workshops / conferences & meetings...meet people"; "definitely improved my communication skills and my confidence"; "gained more confidence in myself"; and "taught me to organise & structure everything". HOD comments are similarly positive with many HODs commenting specifically on the maturity and growth of the GA or on their improved confidence.

Facilities

During interviews most HODs commented on the importance of available facilities prior to accepting a GA. Part of the status of a GA in a department is dependent on their personal space allocation. GAs with limited space allocations tended to be less comfortable in departmental relationships, however this was also dependent on maturity and self confidence. Other GAs with good facilities, who were not confident in their departmental relationships, tended to use their offices as a refuge, which increased the communication gap.

The provision of facilities for GAs at TN are very much better than those quoted at some international institutions where Razza (In Ratnesar: 1999), an American GA, noted that she worked in "... a basement room where 40 other GAs share 29 desks and one computer". The international literature identified the tendency for shared and cramped conditions, limited telephone and computer access and even the sharing of desks. Ninety five percent of GAs at TN have their own desks. The one GA without a desk noted this was due to working in a laboratory type environment. Most GAs have their own bookcase and cupboard, and only one says there is insufficient stationery. According to the GAs, eight have their own office, although one stated "I have to use temporary office space in the tea room", and twelve have their own phone. This indicates most GAs are adequately provided for in the way of their own space to work and study.

Eleven GAs stated they use their own computer, eight share a computer, and only one GA indicated that there was no computer access. HODs commented that only ten GAs had their own computer and the others all had access to a shared computer. Computer access, and the ability to use this technology well, is becoming indispensable for academic purposes and individual facilities for all staff should be a priority in all departments. This may be a problem in some departments as one GA commented: "only if we can get an additional computer".

In advanced countries such as Singapore, many students at universities have laptop computers and general education, some institutions are making provision for one computer for every two students. Increasing amounts of the curriculum are based on computer technology. While TN may not be at this level for some time - the need to improve access must drive the process. Asmal (October 2000, and July 1999) talks of the issues relating to information and communication technology as one of the most important issues to be addressed by higher education. As a technological institution, computer access and intensive utilisation of the available technology to access and share resources and information is imperative.

The affect of space allocation on status was summed up with a statement from one GA. "facilities are not abundant, yet it is impressive how everyone ... has been provided with their own space, this encourages one to feel like they belong in the department. I feel like a valued member of staff who contributes to my department".

Library Resources

Self initiated staff development in regard to the GA programme is currently limited due to the lack of library resources on graduate assistantships and the particular nature of issues relating to these positions. GAs had attempted to find more information about the programme and this was noted by library staff who had received such requests from GAs. Responses in the questionnaires commented on the deficiency of resources. One response illustrated the thirst for information "...like to see the results [of this research] ...want to hear other sides as well...maybe your research will answer all my questions". One study will not be able to provide all answers, but improving access to resources will contribute to solving the problem relating to the paucity of information.

The resources identified through the research and other resources should be available to the greater TN community in order for the programme to develop. Most information came from the experiences in the USA where books and conference papers on a multitude of aspects and issues relating to GA programmes are available. There is even a dedicated journal and videos available. Internet access directly to various institutions offering GA programmes makes for easy communication with the international experiences. Once the community involved with GAs at TN know of the resources available internationally, this problem will resolve itself. However, access to these resources will encourage internationalisation of the GA experience at TN and management, support departments, HODs and other staff will need to be prepared that this may raise more questions than answers. While Internet web sites are extensive and well constructed for most international institutions, providing easy access for sharing information, most South African institutions are only beginning to use this method of information dissemination and access.

4.2.2 MENTORSHIP

Introduction

The most beneficial issue to arise from this study is that in general, there is a great deal of optimism in the responses of GAs, HODs and management relating to the GA programme. This suggests the concept should be nurtured and developed in order to fulfill its mission of developing a cohort of young black academics. Although this attitude may have been skewed by the fact that all returned responses were identifiable, and a more critical response may have been recorded with an anonymous survey, the comments obtained showed mutual respect - especially between HOD and GA. This background of mutual respect is ideal on which to base a mentoring programme.

Internationally, the success of the GA programmes were attributed to successful mentorship programmes. Nyquist and Wulff (1996: 3) identified that some faculty members would want to supervise research assistants while others would be happier with teaching assistants due to the nature of their personal career goals. Because the supervision and mentorship process is so important to the success of the programme, it is beneficial to allow these natural tendencies to influence the direction of each GA post.

Blackwell (1988) and others, in Brown-Wright et al (1997), noted that mentors are role models, either positive or negative. Effective mentoring means the mentor must spend time with the mentee outside of the classroom. It is this contact that is associated with many important educational outcomes such as intellectual development, interpersonal skills, educational aspirations, autonomy and independence, and attainment and interest in scholarly careers.

Discussion with a respondent from management at TN indicated that the time needed to mentor the GA was supposed to be one of the trade-offs to being allocated a GA. The time the GA spends on departmental matters is meant to compensate for the time needed to develop the GA - this includes all the mentorship necessary.

At the HODs' workshop at TN in April 2000, it was indicated that the department is to assume responsibility of the GA, with the hours lectured by the GA being presumed to be in lieu of the time needed to provide mentorship for the development of the GA. Whether this aspect was fully comprehended by the HODs is debatable. The GA post is not supposed to be used to supplement a shortage of teaching allocation. For many small departments this intention may not be adhered to. Comments from HODs indicate that the GA may be used as a replacement staff member: "...has become the 5th member of staff that will be sorely missed next year" and "my left and right hand...at times I could not have run the dept without my GA".

However, with good support most GAs learn to cope with the demands of academia far better when fully utilised, and comments showed the satisfaction felt by the GAs when really appreciated as a member of the departmental team due to their contribution to the department.

Mentorship of the GA at TN

Mentoring, formal or informal, is recognised at TN as an important part of the success of each graduate assistantship, however mentorship is still a fledging concept at TN. An HOD told of a mentoring programme “presently in its infancy in our department”. The mentorship programme at TN is currently a different initiative to the GA programme. The opportunity to combine the programmes in some way may present solutions to the weakness relating to mentorship and the GA programmes in most departments.

One GA admitted not knowing formally who her mentor was until she was required to answer the questionnaire, however the process of her mentorship was functioning very well. It is in similar informal arrangements that some of the most important aspects of mentoring are happening, with some formal mentoring arrangements falling far short of their desired outcomes. Some concern was expressed regarding over formalising the mentoring process, and turning it into a bureaucratic exercise which would terminate the potential of the growing programme. Interviews indicated however that some degree of learning more about the programme would enhance the concept. Most of the comments on mentoring were very positive and showed some considerable insight.

Eighteen GAs at TN indicated they had a departmental mentor and four GAs knew their faculty mentor by name. Eleven GAs indicated they had no knowledge of faculty mentors, while five others either wrote the incorrect name or had forgotten the name of the person. The HOD responses corresponded with the GAs regarding the departmental mentors. Eleven HODs acknowledged the existence of the faculty mentors while six did not. Even during interviews one GA queried the role of the faculty mentor. This seems to indicate that while mentoring may be happening at departmental level, it was not really functioning at faculty level. This may be expected - the mentorship concept requires close partnering and the environment may be too diverse over a faculty.

The correct allocation of the mentor was highlighted by the following two responses: “The mentoring process has been a success since I have my HOD as mentor. Even though I had someone else before assigned to me as a mentor, I never consulted with her” and “[mentorship] process in the dept is excellent. Dept mentor is also sharing with me the subject I teach (team teaching). He helps me a lot with my studies...my supervisor for my research along with the HOD”. A formal mentor appointment may not even be necessary “my HOD has been very supportive and I don’t even think she knows that she’s my mentor”. Another HOD acknowledged that she would not be the right person to mentor the GA.

Mentoring between the departments seems to be handled in different ways. Two HODs varied in their opinions as to how to run their mentorship programmes with one stating that “3 dept mentors - 1 for each subject” were used and the other said: “has been very successful because a dedicated mentor has been used”. A GA commented that: “As per my request the mentoring is done by all the lecturers in the department. I requested this so that each individual lecturer can have an input”. This last comment was altered further along in the questionnaire when the same GA noted “I would like to have a mentor responsible for my entire period as a graduate assistant”. The HOD concerned noted the same: “No specific mentor...have been some problems...realise he needs to be attached to one person”.

The time needed for successful mentorship was commented on by a number of HODs: “does

impinge on her private time"; "not enough time spent together (assessments, interviews, discussions, feedback sessions etc)"; "time is a problem as we are very short staffed" ; "perhaps she could be more closely monitored but we all lead very busy lives"; "intense 'discussions' have been very rewarding to both parties - although very time consuming for mentor". In addition to time constraints there were some comments which focused on contact and availability: "Not much contact with mentors at this stage"; "suppose to meet daily... but instead only meet occasionally"; and "The problem is that my mentor is a hard to get person, otherwise he is very helpful".

Mentors at TN act in various roles. For some GAs the mentoring is part of their personal development and for others it relates more to the development of teaching skills. One GA commented on their mentor as having "taught me a skill on how sometimes to overcome general problems that you may come across before they even arise". Another said: "I always consult with her when there are things I don't understand and she always makes time for me". More direct mentorship was noted by HODs who said: "GA is lecturing one class of a subject the mentor controls...proving successful as they have contact on a daily basis regarding problems ...[and] feedback" and "mentor is assisting GA with delivery of lessons, classroom control, etc".

A very academic impression was conveyed by this response from one GA: "The mentor programme definitely seeks to assist student academic success & psychological development by facilitating their adjustment into the Technikon, affording them the ability to read the culture of the campus. This is definitely achieved through a mentor as he/she creates a climate for interchange and interaction. I highly recommend that all departments become actively involved with this programme". A more relaxed approach stated: "We mentor each other coz we all have expertise and we recognise each individuals unique expertise".

Suggestions to improve the mentorship programme from the GAs included "faculty mentor needs to organise regular meetings (optional) for new staff to exchange and discuss their challenges in academia" and "it needs to be more systematic and structured, more outcomes based".

Issues Affecting Mentoring

A number of issues affecting the mentoring process at Technikon Natal were identified through the responses received by the questionnaires. The age analysis of all GAs showed nearly sixty percent of GAs to be younger than 25 years. The GAs in international programmes are generally older than 25 years, as these GA programs seem to be focused on Masters and Doctoral qualifications whereas at TN the focus is on BTech with a few Masters students. The major issue indicated by this is that the GAs at TN would be substantially less "mature", in age, academically, and professionally, than those on a similar programme internationally. The affect this would have on techniques used in mentoring, and the choice of mentor must be considered.

In seven out of twenty cases, the HODs rated the length of prior work experience as being less than the GA indicted and four GAs said they had less work experience than their HODs thought they had. These differences may be due to perceptions of what constitutes work experience (full time, part time or experiential training for instance), however the general

trend indicates that the GAs and the HODs are thinking differently about prior work experience. Although prior work experience is not a prerequisite for the GA programme, it is one of the areas of concern for many HODs and GAs (see earlier discussion). Instances where the HOD does not credit the GA with the experience the GA believes himself to possess, could lead to dissonance. The reverse situation could lead to the HOD allocating the GA duties for which the GA is under-prepared. This has implications for the mentoring process.

Development Levels of GAs

Nyquist and Wulff (1996, p5-6) suggest that the supervisor tries to group the GA into one of three levels. The first stage is that of "Senior Learner", with the new GA usually selected from the senior undergraduate pool because they have demonstrated some quality showing potential for both academic and faculty development. The next stage is reached when the GA has some experience of the position and this Nyquist and Wulff term as "Colleague-in-Training". During this stage the relationship may focus mainly on advising or on role-modelling effective behaviours and approaches to teaching/research. The final stage, when nearing completion of the contract, the GA is more like a colleague, or peer, than a subordinate, and therefore the term of reference used is "Junior Colleague".

The three GAs contracted prior to 1999 had their GA contracts extended past the two year period. Reasons behind the extensions were well motivated and supported by good reports of the GAs performance in their respective departments. These three GAs and the four GAs contracted in 1999 would all be considered as Junior Colleagues. One HOD with a longer term GA noted the metamorphosis which: "...transformed a staff/student relationship to a more academic / informal colleague basis". Comments from GAs showed similar responses: "...at first I was lost ...but as time went on ...[I] started to realise that I'm no longer a normal student but a junior lecturer"; "...before I was a student and now that I'm half student half academic my behaviour has to be adjusted". The twelve GAs contracted in January 2000 would be termed "Colleague-in-Training" and the three GAs who began their contracts later would be moving from the "Senior Learner" phase into the "Colleague-in-Training" phase. In January a new batch of GAs will begin their contracts in the "Senior Learner" phase. The HODs responded through the questionnaires as being quite distant from their GAs in initial stages, but those HODs with long term GAs were, in the main, very close to their mentees. The relationship had changed from one of staff-student contact to that of collaborating colleague.

Nyquist and Wulff (1996) use these phases to illustrate how the role of the mentor or supervisor changes in order to accommodate the change in the GA. The corresponding mentor phases are those of manager, model and mentor respectively. Although these stages are set out as a consecutive process, they are possibly more related to the development of the GA in specific circumstances, and as such are more of a sequence of many cycles.

Most HODs in interviews indicated they positioned different role models, or mentors, with their GAs at different times of the development phase. In the early stages, a mentor with a nurturing nature was more appropriate and later on more challenging personalities were introduced. This showed considerable concern as to the development of the GA.

Prior experience with GA

In response to the research, many HODs commented on how the affect of a prior experience with a departmental GA, whether positive or negative, impacted on the relationship with the current GA. Some HODs had negative experiences and others had very positive experiences. In all cases it meant the new GA was treated with caution. Two HODs mentioned that because of a negative experience with a past GA, they did not want to encourage another GA scholarship in their department, although one of these HODs had since received another GA and was very satisfied with the performance. Some of the comments from HODs regarding the relationship between past and present GAs included the following: "... the current GA have no problems relating to staff and students, the previous one do not relate to staff at all but not too bad with students"; "Currently no problems...stricter with present GA after failures with previous GA"; "...first GA was excellent. This one has had some enjoyable periods...but other aspects have been a strain"; and "Yes, the current person is developing into a worthwhile lecturer. The previous one I have my doubts".

The presence of negative connotations, albeit minimal at this stage, indicates a potential for further studies, as only current departments with GAs were included in the sample for the questionnaires. If departments lose interest in the programme because of negative experiences, some form of intervention must be undertaken to prevent similar occurrences in the future. Negative experiences must not be hidden in personnel records, but analysed to provide potential for improvement of the programme. It must be noted that the GA programme has developed substantially in the last few years, and some of the difficulties experienced in the past have led to this development. The value of mentoring was expressed by an HOD who indicated that some problems encountered with a GA "... could improve with intensive mentoring". The mentorship programme is one of the least developed interventions and should it be developed correctly, has the possibility to reduce other problems.

GAs Mentoring Undergraduate Students

The GAs, as young educators, are excellently placed to become mentors and role models for the undergraduates they lead. The responsibility as role model is one which all educators carry, and whether the GA consciously adopts the role or not will have no difference on the outcome. While the GAs are following the role models, positive or negative, of their supervisors so the undergraduate students will either try to emulate the GA or be the opposite. This effect was noted by Nyquist and Wulff (1996:2). The various ways in which the GA can optimise their position, beyond tutoring and communication assistance, have not been considered by most departments. Cultural diversity, lifeskills, ethics and values, health, and safety issues could all be addressed. Some of the major issues facing undergraduates relate to academic integrity and plagiarism with the ease of downloading information of the Internet, and as noted by Robertson (1997), GAs are ideally placed to assume a vital role in developing sound ethics in undergraduates. Another issue facing undergraduates particularly in South Africa is that of HIV/AIDS. GAs could be pivotal in bringing discussion into the open and equipping undergraduates with the confidence necessary to allow for wise decision making habits.

Most respondents in this study indicated that the GAs' mentoring of undergraduates is part of their contracts, with only one HOD and two GAs indicating it was not part of the contract.

Both GAs said that they were still doing mentoring - even though they didn't think they were required to: "mentoring of students...may not be part of my contract but is still done voluntarily" and "mentoring students is not stipulated in my contract but I do it anyway...I am happy about that". HOD and GA responses indicated that between 3% and 40% of the GAs' time was spent mentoring, with an average of around 10%. Responses from management indicated between 10 and 30% of time should be allocated to student mentoring with an average of nearly 20%. This high allocation of time reduces time available for other GA related activities, and will need to be discussed along with all time related factors.

There is excellent potential for benefits to be gained from GAs mentoring undergraduates. One GA response noted: "I am the only black person in the department, black students also need someone to talk to about everything". An HOD commented on this aspect as well stating the GA could assist "... individuals of second language (particularly Black students) backgrounds in terms of communication, assimilation and interpretation of syllabus work, and assisting lecturing staff". This must not be seen as an abdication of responsibility for other staff members and careful monitoring of the mentorship process should be undertaken. In addition, if the GA is to be used effectively in mentoring undergraduates, more emphasis must be placed on teaching the GA about mentoring and how to mentor.

Departmental Relationships

Departmental relationships are part of the informal mentoring process. In many departments, the responsibility to nurture the GA is not taken by one staff member, and all staff are involved, some to a greater extent than others.

The check block responses to the question on departmental relationships showed 75% of both GAs and HODs rated their relationship to each other as "Very Good". One GA was so enthusiastic that she made a new column to rate her HOD as "Excellent". Sixty percent of HODs thought their GA had "Very Good" relationships with the rest of the departmental staff, although slightly less GAs were as sure of this. Sixty-five percent of HODs thought their GA had "Very Good" relationships with the students, and again less GAs were as sure of this. These figures indicate the GA is less sure of the success of their relationships with other staff and students than their HOD. Written comments on the departmental relationships showed more reservation on the part of the HODs, as illustrated by these comments: "I think they [the relationships] are good, but it is not always possible to gauge whether [the GA] is feeling that way..." and a noncommittal "...very early to make value judgement".

Apart from this difference, the reverse of these figures indicates that, in nearly half of the cases, there is room for improving the staff and student relationships with the GAs. In 25% of cases, the GA and HODs relationship can be improved. This has implications for mentoring. Communication and support needs to be improved in order to encourage the inculcation of the GA into the department. Either the mentor or the HOD needs to spend some time discussing any potential feelings of apprehension about departmental relationships both towards, and from, the GA. Some comments by the GAs indicated that more time should be made for discussion: "its just that everybody is busy, I don't get time to sit and chat with them"; "...do not understand whether I'm fully integrated or not"; "It depends on the lecturers some of them are 100% nice... some of them are monsters".

There were however some very positive comments made by the GAs such as : "I feel like

I am part of a team here"; "I don't even feel like a Grad-assistant but as one of the lecturers"; "they are ever ready and willing to help not just with academic work but also when I have personal problems" and "I cannot explain the support I get from the department - its excellent". The benefits of the affirmative action aspect of the programme were also evidenced by one GA with a comment refering to relationships with students: "I am the only black person in the department they [the students] feel more comfortable talking to me".

The fact that the questionnaire was not anonymous may have skewed the responses given. It is presumed the bias would be on the optimistic side, indicating there may be room for even more improvement in the relationships. Most interviews with GAs and HODs showed that there are some tensions in departmental relationships. Common problems often related to cultural etiquette - evidenced where concern about inadvertently offending each other meant the degree of politeness was higher than would be found in homogenous departments. This tension is to be expected and encouragement should be given for all parties to acknowledge it in order to allow the department to work through cultural differences. Departments with second level GAs, the Junior Colleague, as Nyquist and Wulff (1996) refer to them, had mostly overcome this constraint.

Issues of Communication

Although communication was not a specific question on either the GA and HOD questionnaires, issues relating to communication appeared in many responses. These issues presented in both written comments and was evident when paired HOD and GA responses were compared and found to differ substantially. Due to the identification of this as potentially important issue, questions on communication were included in both the survey to management and in the interviews for paired GAs and HODs. Responses to both of these data gathering tools confirmed that there is opportunity for substantial improvement in the area of communication. Several issues were identified including interpersonal communication issues relating to age, gender or racial differences; and communication of issues relating to the GA programme including vision and purpose, expectations and roles of HODs, GAs, departmental and faculty mentors, and appraisal and feedback. There is an indication that while most HODs are very well informed about the GA programme, and some departments are doing very well, some may need additional assistance.

The mentor has the most valuable role to play in increasing communication channels for the GA. Development of the GA mentorship programme must take this seriously into account. Many of the following problems could be solved or reduced through effective mentoring and their presence indicates the failure of effective mentoring in most instances. Comments by GAs relating to directly to communication with mentors include: "...suppose to meet daily to discuss current problems I face but instead only meet occasionally where there is a problem"; "...problem is that my mentor is a hard to get person". An unavailable mentor is not much use as a mentor.

Although at senior levels the vision and purpose of the programme is relatively clear, at each subsequent level the focus of the GA programme reduces as implementation problems become more demanding. While most respondents from management acknowledged the vision of the programme is to address future staff equity, insufficient attention has been given to mapping out a career path for the GA. HODs tend to accept the vision but are caught in the middle of the actual implementation of the GA programme and future staffing versus

viability concerns for their departments. The need for a GA to obtain work experience is one issue that interrupts the advertised career path of "enter with a diploma, two years GA and then potential of a full time job as an academic" and this issue has not been adequately resolved. At the GA level there is less commitment to a future as an academic than there should be as most GAs are very dubious as to the possibility of future appointments.

HODs have to allocate time for the GA along with another 163 items (Guidelines for an Academic HOD, TN, 1999) which they are expected to control. Misunderstandings and poor communication are therefore more likely to be related to a lack of time than to any other reason and these time constraints were noted by many HODs and GAs. Lack of feedback is another problem area. Some of the written responses relating to insufficient feedback are: "...since I got into being GA, I have not yet had any progress report from HOD and other staff". This was particularly worrying because this GA was amongst the longer term GAs. Another commented that "...at times I don't clearly understand whether I do what is right because there is no constant feedback from the dept". One GA commented on wanting to be included more in departmental decision making and "...being part of problem solving and being involved in the report back of students that are not doing well". Other GAs are given the necessary guidance as one commented: "...my duties and responsibilities are very clear to me".

Two comments specifically mention the possibility of unhappy GAs: "All that bothers me is that GAs do not have an official job description. This could be problematic to some GA who are not in supportive depts" and "I know of someone who actually came and talked with me of a difficulty he is having and it's sad". Mentorship will unfortunately not be the answer to all the problems all GAs encounter, but adoption of some of the principles will assist many of these young academics to find answers to some of their questions.

Tenured / Permanent posts at completion

A mentorship programme also brings its own problems when combined with a lack of a clearly defined career path for the GAs. One of the main problems identified could come through the close bond, forged between the GA and their HOD or mentor, in conflict with the clause in the TN contract relating to the permanent position at the end of the contract. In most cases both the GAs and the HODs have indicated a desired for the contracts to be continued into full time positions. There are many issues to be carefully thought through before appointing GAs into full time positions. Although the goal is for staff equity the technikon must also ensure maintenance of quality and viability. Commitment to equity should be seen in conjunction with the vision of the technikon. If the focus of the institution remains highly technological then work experience is critical. Many of the current GAs show huge potential but can the institution afford to carry their appointments while they gain work experience during vacations or sabbaticals? While the GA programme was in its infancy at TN, this was not an issue. However, the programme is gaining momentum with each year and unless this issue is addressed it will threaten the future of the programme.

The bond nurtured through the GAs development process now means that should a full time post be available at the specific time, the HOD would have to decide between offering the GA the position and attracting outside, and possibly more experienced, staff. While the GA may want the post, the HOD concerned may know that it would not be in the best interests of the GA to take the post at this stage of their career path. Should there be no post

available, the HOD may feel that he has let his colleague down. It is then difficult for the HOD, while wearing several "hats", to counsel the GA.

Preparing GAs as junior academics is a difficult situation without the constant conflict caused by worrying if a full time post will be available and whether the GA would be the best person to fill it. A situation was identified by one HOD who indicated that preparing the GA for an area of speciality where a post may become available in the department would mean pairing the GA with a staff member who may not have been the best role model for the GA. In the best interests for the future of the GA this presents a dilemma. Most departments have different areas of speciality within their departments. Preparing a GA in one speciality limits their chances of employment if a post arises in another speciality, and a more general preparation places limitations on the possibilities of a GA getting a post where specialisation is needed. The only way around these issues is to produce more GAs than there are posts available, although this has funding and other implications.

The current ratio of full time employment after completion of a GA contract is 5:28 although this does not take into consideration the seven GAs due to complete their contracts at the end of 2000. It is possible this ratio will become 5:35 or 1:7. This figure provides a very rough indication that if the GA programme is going to be used to develop African lecturers to meet future academic equity targets, for every one academic needed, seven African diplomates should be given an opportunity to be a GA. A higher rate of GAs achieving permanent employment after completion of GA contract would reduce the number of GAs needed to provide the return required. Planned career pathing would indicate which way would be the best option.

It has already been noted that GAs who do not obtain immediate full time posts, have still benefited through their preparation as GAs. Some of these GAs may return to academia after obtaining some work experience, others will pursue postgraduate careers in their area of speciality. Marketing the GA programme will need to show future GAs the benefits of these options. One GA shared her thoughts on the possibility of a two year contract only, as not being an attractive option. She indicated she would not be interested in the scheme if there was no possibility of a position at the end. This may be an opinion shared by other GAs. However, HODs surveyed indicated that few diplomates could earn the salary offered to a GA, for what is in essence a half day job, in addition to receiving tuition fee remission, academic leave, and the benefit of intensive development programmes. As mentioned by Boroviak (1991) the total value of the GA contract should be used as a valuable recruiting tool.

The constant uncertainty of full time employment after the term of contract leads to unnecessary stress and possibly poor decision making and problem solving methods. Removing this clause from the contract will mean the focus can be on the GAs personal development - not hindered by shifting future departmental needs. It is more difficult to persuade a GA to leave than to persuade them to stay so the clause is unnecessary. Should the GA want to move on, a binding clause will not encourage good staff morale and performance. Emotionally and whether consciously or unconsciously, the frustration this predicament may cause, will usually be taken out on the initiators of the concept.

In France, GAs do not have any special rights or obligations with regard to the State for their later career (Bouchet, 1993: 340-341). However, as they are selected from the best

postgraduate students and are specially trained to teach at university level, the GA has considerable advantages if they do apply for these posts. In addition the time spent as GA is taken into consideration and they would spend shorter periods as probationary lecturers, being granted tenure more quickly. Bouchet continues to describe how the Ministry offers GAs a year of temporary employment on completion of the programme. The workload of this temporary position is equivalent to that of a lecturer. A competition is held to recruit lecturers after this period. Bouchet noted that all members of the first intake on the programme obtained posts. This was noted by an HOD at TN who made a similar proposal. This idea should be considered if funds or departmental staffing allocations permitted.

Langenberg (1998) in his study on higher education staffing in the USA, discusses the concern and unease relating to the growing use of part-time academics and GAs. He states that there is little evidence that academics and management understand the underlying problems, or that academia knows what to do about the tensions. This stage may have been reached in the GA programme at TN. The way to address the success rate of the GA programme, whether concerning optimal growth for the GA personally, or achievement of a staff appointment at the end of the GA programme, is through mentorship and support, in teaching skills, academic skills and life skills.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CONCLUSION

Higher education in South Africa has been in a transitional stage for almost a decade as it has been changing from the segregated, differentially funded and fragmented structure of the apartheid era. Higher education has become more unified through the development of a structured education policy encompassing all levels of education and training, however at the same time, social pressures have increased including an influx of underprepared students, financial constraints, concerns regarding quality and the need to provide well prepared people to ensure the success of the future economy of the country. These changes are still incomplete and are expected to span another decade as the developing vision for higher education takes on a still more focused viewpoint - including other factors such as the affect of developing technologies, further economical constraints and HIV/AIDS are also included in the scenario.

The increase in higher qualifications from the technikon sector is desirable in order to produce the technological foundation for the country's future economy. In order to achieve this goal, one of the many factors that needs addressing is the development of African academics. The GA programme initiated at TN has the potential to assist in this regard. As stated in the Employment Equity Policy (1997:10) of TN- it is essential to create a "...new institutional culture respectful of diversity, dedicated...to the values of the new democracy and the rectification of the composition of the TN staff profile so that it will best be suited to effectively serve the larger population of our society" and this programme is one of the initiatives set in place to achieve this goal.

The study has identified great potential in the GAs and in the community at TN who have embraced this opportunity to develop the young academics of the future. Although there are a number of issues to be addressed which have emerged as the programme has developed, the overall consensus is that the GA programme is a good method of staff development. The key stakeholders of this study, the GAs and their HODs, have shown strong bonds of development and growth. This relationship is underpinned by the support from management and the support units at TN. The concept is right for the time and place and presents good possibility for expansion.

This exploratory study has attempted to identify the issues that could further enhance the programme at TN. It is proposed that this programme could be successfully used for national staff development, especially for the technikon and technical college sectors where a focus on increasing access to, and quality of, the BTech level of qualification is paramount. The ultimate goal, once a stronger BTech base has been developed, should be the level of the MTech degree and beyond. This should be encouraged as soon as a BTech base is established, should the programme or discipline have been identified as a need for the economy of the country. These national needs are expected to be identified through the National Skills Plans as submitted through the various SETAs.

Due to the different educational focus of universities, these institutions are likely to be less affected than the technikon sector by the skills plans from the SETAs. The applicability of

an affirmative action GA programme at university level would possibly follow international trends with the offering of the programme at the Masters degree level. In principle however, the issues identified in this study and from international sources, indicate that the institutional focus and the nature of the subject matter to be taught at undergraduate level is secondary to the staff development issues raised.

The following recommendations are informed by the research conducted in the study and follow the same structure as the previous chapters in that the difference between the institutional factors and individual factors, while still maintaining a close interdependency, needs to be clearly defined. As stated earlier, while these recommendations refer to the GA programme at TN, the concept could be used by other institutions.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The overriding issue to be addressed is that before any further action is taken, Management at TN needs to decide on the vision for the GA programme. Due to the relatively short duration of an individual GA scholarship and the long term restructuring of higher education, physically in terms of the proposals for KwaZulu Natal and academically in terms of the NQF, both the development of a short term and a medium term goal are indicated. As there will be a new group of GAs starting as early as January 2001, interim measures should be implemented to benefit their placements, however a more strategic approach should be taken regarding future appointments.

Institutional considerations need to include the development of a new institutional vision and mission - informed by both changes in higher education and the emerging national skills audits from the various industrial and business sectors. This will inform the identification and setting of planned staff targets - necessary to provide quality education for key programmes and disciplines - while meeting staff equity issues. Although these measures are ongoing and are part of the Equity plan for the institution, they need to be communicated clearly to the HODs.

Some of the issues relating specifically to the GA programme that need discussion are:

- 1 Determination of a standardised administration structure for initiating post.
 - * Department's motivation to offer a GA post - motivate with career path, industry need, departmental strategic plan, provision of mentors, adequate facilities, and available subject matter (level, class size, subject matter, etc) to be taught from the outset. This could be provided in guideline format to simplify the task.
 - * Recruitment and appointment - follow normal staffing guidelines. Main criteria to be eligibility for BTech study, not necessarily in host department. Consider language proficiency testing to identify weaknesses, not necessarily exclude.
 - * Job descriptions and induction - HODs must obtain a copy of the GA contract and attend meetings to understand fully about the vision of the programme. HODs to discuss vision, goals, conditions etc before GA begins work. Each new semester should be started with a new set of criteria (*see point 2 below)

- 2 The development of a structure for a GA programme using the guidelines presented by Nyquist and Wulff's (1996) stages of a GA and the implications (supervision, staff development, subject material, duties etc) for these stages:
 - * Senior Learner - first semester
 - * Colleague in Training - second semester
 - * Junior Colleague - second year
- 3 Consideration of a standardised approach in determining the hours expected, and the breakdown of those hours in terms of balancing the goals to
 - * providing an opportunity to obtain a postgraduate degree and
 - * the development of a junior lecturer.

This would include the time to study, the time to gain teaching and academic experience, the support needed to ensure the achievement of these goals and departmental time to offset the investment (time and finance) in the GAs development. Foundation of a sound work ethic for future academics to be laid.
- 4 Development of the support mechanisms needed for the post including:
 - * the structure of the academic induction programme for teaching skills - specific to the GA needs. This could be aligned to new lecturers induction, and in some instances overlap, but should not be the same. Separate programmes would mean if a GA became a fulltime lecturer, they could still go through the formal staff induction. This is very important as the focus through which the GA approaches staff development and that of a new lecturer are different. Must include institutional matters (quality, OBE, etc). Must support departmental initiatives, not replace them.
 - * academic support (academic writing, research skills, information literacy, information technology and language proficiency) to ensure the GA obtains the qualification in the required time span.
 - * the skills needed to ensure the personal development of the GA - involve the Counselling Unit extensively. GAs could be used for undergraduate lay-counsellors as well if trained in these areas..
- 5 Development of an integrated mentorship programme - mentors must be interested in developing young academics - don't just give this to anyone. Natural bonding for mentorship preferred rather than allocated mentor. Diversity management (culture, race, gender etc) workshops should be part of the programme for HODs, mentors and GAs in order to address communication difficulties that arise due to differences. Mentoring programme for GAs both being a mentor for undergraduates and being mentored themselves.
- 6 Consideration of the starting level of the monetary value of the scholarship in terms of increasing accessibility, ensuring available funds are effectively utilised, providing the GA with a livable income, and ensuring remuneration is market related and task related. Further consideration to an increasing scale in value of remuneration between the first and second year of the scholarship, and between BTech and MTech levels would improve the motivational aspect.

- 7 Due consideration must be given to whether the clause regarding possible full time employment after completion of the post is beneficial. Incorporating work experience into the concept of the programme must be considered to maintain the technological edge of the institution.
- 8 Seeking additional funding (Redress Funding, Skills Development Levy, National Skills Fund, donors, research grants, etc) to increase access at least to the first year - possibly making the second year a merit (academic and good teaching/service) award. Allocation of GAs not limited to one per department, but as per discipline need and departmental success. Seek to increase the programme to accommodate research and administrative GAs using other funding mechanisms.
- 9 Communicate information though
 - * developing a GA information handbook - institutional and departmental.
 - * investing in library resource material - journal, videos, books.
- 10 Determination of a standardised appraisal structure for HODs to use with GAs.
 - * Performance Appraisals and feedback.
 - * Disciplinary and grievance procedures should be addressed.
 - * Developmental career plans in conjunction with departmental plans.
- 11 Promote GA programme as career path for undergraduates. Develop a structured senior undergraduate tutoring programme to support the transition. Start a competition / award programme for good teaching practices and good academic performance for GAs. Market and promote the GA position as fundamental to the future development of academics. Do not change the name - it is recognised internationally - rather elevate the status of the GA through mentorship and respect.

REFERENCES

- Asmal, K. 2000. *Issues in Higher Education: Imperatives of Equity and Redress*. Speech read at the Conference of the Association of Vice-chancellors of the Historically Disadvantaged Tertiary Institutions in South Africa (ASAHDl), Sandton Convention Centre, Johannesburg, 20 October 2000.
- Baker, M.P. 1993. *Mentoring as Teaching and Learning*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Diego, March 1993.
- Bell, J. 1999. *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-time Researchers in Education and Social Science*. 3rd ed. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bernard, J. 1994. Ethical and Legal Dimensions of Supervision. *ERIC Digest*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Blaxter, L., Hughes, C and Tight, M. 1998. *The Academic Career Handbook*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bollington, R., Hopkins, D and West, M. 1990. *An Introduction to Teacher Appraisal: A Professional Development Approach*. London: Cassell Educational Limited.
- Boice, R. 1992. *The New Faculty Member: Supporting and Fostering Professional Development*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Boroviak, P.C. 1991. An Examination of Policies and Procedures used in the Administration of Physical Education Graduate Assistantship Programs. *Physical Educator*, 47(4): 204-209.
- Bouchet, R. 1993. Introduction to Teaching at University Level: A Special Graduate Assistant Programme. *Higher Education Management*. November 1993, 5(3): 339-343.
- Brown-Wright, D.A., Dubick, R.A and Newman, I. 1997. GA Expectation and Faculty Perception: Implications for Mentoring and Training. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38(4): 410-416.
- Chase, J.L. 1970. *Graduate Teaching Assistants in American Universities: A Review of Recent Trends and Recommendations*. Washington D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cox, M.D. 1995. The Development of New and Junior faculty. In: Wright, W.A and Associates. (eds.) 1995. *Successful Strategies for Higher Education*. Bolton MA: Anker publishing. pp. 283-310.
- Cuthbert, R. (ed.) 1996. *Working in Higher Education*. The Society for Research into Higher Education. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Darling, C.A and Earhart, E.M. 1990. A model for Preparing Graduate Students as Educators. *Family Relations*, 39(3): 341-48.
- De Lange, G. 1998. *A Proposed Outcome Based Tertiary Bridging Programme Aimed at Providing Students / Graduates with the General Skills Required to Cope with the Demands of the Workplace*. Paper read at the National Conference on Co-Operative Education in the New Millennium, Technikon Natal, Durban, April 2000.
- Feezel, J.D and Meyers, S.A. 1997. Assessing Graduate Assistant Teacher Communication Concerns. *Communication Quarterly*, 45(3): 110-124.
- Fullerton, H. (ed.) 1998. *Facets of Mentoring in Higher Education 2*. Birmingham: Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA).
- Fulton, O. 1996. Which Academic Profession are You In? In: Cuthbert, R. (ed.) 1996. *Working in Higher Education*. The Society for Research into Higher Education. Buckingham: Open University Press. pp.157-169.

- Gaff, J.G and Lambert, L.M. 1996. Socialising Future Faculty to the Values of Undergraduate Education. *Change*, **28**(4): 38-46.
- Graduate School, North Carolina State University. *Graduate Teaching Assistants' Handbook*. [online] Available from: http://www.fis.ncsu.edu/grad_publicns/ta_handb.htm. [Accessed 3 June 2000].
- Graduate School, North Carolina State University. *International Teaching Assistant (ITA) Policy*. [online] Available from: http://www.fis.ncsu.edu/grad_publicns/itapolcy.html. [Accessed 15 September 2000].
- Karathanos, D. 1999. Quality: Is Education Keeping Pace with Business? *Journal of Education for Business*, Mar/Apr 1999. **74**(4): 231-236.
- Koehnecke, D.S. 1991. *Boundaries of Graduate Assistants: Bouncing off Boundaries*. Paper read at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Boston, March 1991.
- Kogan, M., Moses, I and El-Khawas, E. 1994. *Staffing Higher Education - Meeting New Challenges*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Langenberg, D.N. 1998. The Subfaculty. *New Directions for Higher Education*. **26**(4): 39-44.
- Marshall, C and Rossman, G.B. 1999. *Designing Qualitative Research*. 3rd ed. California: Sage.
- Masters, K.J. 1988. *Illiteracy: a Problem for the Humanities*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National American Culture Association, New Orleans, March 1988.
- Meyer, Katrina A. 1998. *Faculty Workload Studies: Perspectives, Needs, and Future Directions*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report . **26**(1). Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Minkel, C.W and Richards, M.P. (eds.) 1983. *A Model Policy for Graduate Assistantship Administration*. Paper identified by the Task Force on Establishing a National Clearinghouse of Materials developed for Teaching Assistant Training. Tennessee, 1983.
- Mullen, C.A and Lick, D.W. 1999. *New Directions in Mentoring: Creating a Culture of Synergy*. London: Falmer Press.
- Nowlis, V., Clark, K.E and Rock, M. 1968. *The Graduate Student as Teacher*. Washington D.C: American Council on Education.
- Nyquist, J.D and Wulff, D.H. 1996. *Working Effectively with Graduate Assistants*. California: Sage.
- Oppenheim, N. 1997. How International Teaching Assistants can Prevent Lawsuits. *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*. **5**(2): 71-79.
- Peach, L.E and Reddick, T.L. 1987. *Legal Issues Affecting Faculty and Administration in Higher Education*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Social Science Association, Orlando, November 1987.
- Pearce, J.A. 1999. Who could Most Effectively Influence Collegiate Business Education Reform? *Journal of Education for Business*, Mar/Apr 1999. **74**(4): 215-220.
- Prior, F.C. 1986. *Technikon Academic Staff Development with Special Reference to Newly Appointed Lecturing Staff*. M. Ed thesis, University of South Africa, Durban.
- Ratnersar, R. 1999. Look for the Union Grader. *Time*, April 12, 1999. **153**(14): 77-79.
- Richardson, James T. 1999. Tenure in the New Millennium. *National Forum*, Winter 1999, **79**(1): 19-24.
- Roach, K.D and Jensen K.K. 1997. TA Training: Social Learning Theory into Practice. *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*. **5**(2): 81-87.
- Robbins, S.P. 1997. *Managing Today!*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Robertson, H.J. 1997. Writing Term Papers: A Plea for Process. *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*. 5(2): 89-90.
- Samuel, L. 1999. Teaching Assistants Strike for Full Time Pay. *The Progressive*, 63(3): 16-19.
- Schoenfeld, A.C and Magnan, R. 1992. *Mentor in a Manual: Climbing the Academic Ladder to Tenure*. Madison: Magna Publications.
- Shamoff, E. 1993. *Neither Fish nor Fowl: Graduate Students, Unionisation and the Academy*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association, Toronto, December 1993.
- Sheehan, J. 1986. Improving Skills of Teaching Assistants. In: *Teaching to Potential: Proceedings of the Regional Conference on University Teaching*, Las Cruces, January 1986.
- South Africa. Towards a New Higher Education Landscape: Meeting the Equity, Quality and Social Development Imperatives of South Africa in the 21st Century. 2000. *Shape and Size of Higher Education Task Team*. Pretoria: Council on Higher Education.
- Stanford University. 2000. *2000-2001 Minimum Salary Rates for Graduate Research Assistants and Teaching Assistants*. [online] Available at: <http://www-portfolio.stanford.edu/106020>. [Accessed 3 June 2000].
- Sullivan, T.A., Svinicki, M.D and Greer, M.J. 1997. Graduate Students, Formal Classroom Training, and the Development of Teaching Role Identification. *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*. 5(2): 57-70.
- Sunter, C. 1992. *The New Century: Quest for the High Road*. Cape Town: Human and Rousseau and Tafelberg Publishers.
- Sutherland, M. E. 1990. Black Faculty in White Academia: the Fit is an Uneasy One. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 14(1): 17-23.
- Technikon Natal. 1997. *Policy Document. Employment Equity Policy*. Durban: Technikon Natal.
- Technikon Natal. 1998. *Policy Document. Staff Development Policy*. Durban: Technikon Natal.
- Technikon Natal. 1998. *Contract - Graduate Assistant*. Durban: Technikon Natal.
- Technikon Natal. 1999. *Contract - Graduate Assistant*. Durban: Technikon Natal.
- Technikon Natal. 1999. *Policy Document. Graduate Assistant Scholarship - Policy and Procedures*. Durban: Technikon Natal.
- Technikon Natal. 1999. *Policy Document. Probation Policy - Newly Appointed Lecturing Staff*. Durban: Technikon Natal.
- Technikon Natal. 1999. *Guidelines to the Responsibilities of an Academic Head of Department*. Durban: Technikon Natal.
- Technikon Natal. 2000. *Proposal for a RITS accredited Induction Programme*. Position Paper for Technikon Natal: Academic Quality Unit. Durban: Technikon Natal.
- Tickle, L. 1994. *The Induction of New Teachers: Reflective Professional Practice*. London: Cassell.
- University of Cape Town. 2000. *Framework Policy for a 'Generic Job Description' for Academic Staff in the 6 Faculties*. [online] Available at: <http://www.uct.ac.za/depts/hrm/staffman/2-14.htm>. [Accessed on 16 October 2000].
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 2000. *Fact Sheet on Graduate Students with Assistantships*. [online] Available at: <http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/gradfactsheet.html>. [Accessed on 5 October 2000].

- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 2000. *Task Force on Graduate Education Report*. [online] Available at: http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/task_force_report/policy_k-m.htm. [Accessed on 5 October 2000].
- University of Maryland. 2000. *Handbook for Graduate Assistants*. [online] Available at: <http://www.inform.umd.edu/EdRes/Gradinfo/Fellowship/gradasst.html>. [Accessed on 15 September 2000].
- Vaughn, W. 1998. Apprentice or Employee? Graduate Students and their Unions. *Academe*, **84**(6): 43-49.
- Weiner, G. 1998. Here a Little, There a Little: Equal Opportunities Policies in Higher Education in the UK. *Studies in Higher Education*, **23**(3): 321-334.
- Wildavsky, B. 2000. Grad Students, the Sorest Apprentices. *U.S. News and World Report*. **128**(11): 66.
- Winberg, C. 1999. *Learning How to Mentor*. Cape Town: Juta and Company in association with Uswe.
- Yin, R.K. 1994. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 2nd ed. California: Sage.

ANNEXURES

Clothing Technology
Block S6 507
☎Extension - 2725
August 2000

Dear
Department of

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

As part of my Masters Degree in Education I am researching the Graduate Assistant (GA) programme at Technikon Natal. I would greatly appreciate your assistance in this matter.

I have requested your contact details in this questionnaire in order to facilitate further investigation. However, your responses will be treated with confidentiality and your identity will be withheld in any publications resulting from this study. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Your responses could assist the Technikon in improving the GA programme. Should you want to write more than the space permits, please attach additional pages, ensuring question numbering is correct.

Should you have further questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many Thanks

Roz Havenga

Name:	GA Post number:
Department:	Faculty:
Undergraduate Qualification:	
Currently registered for:	
Dates of GA contract: Started:	Expected Completion:

Please place an X in the appropriate box where necessary.

SECTION 1 - BIOGRAPHICAL

1	How long have you been a GA?	<1year	1-2 yrs	>2 yrs		
2	How old are you?	<23yrs	23-25yrs	>25yrs		
3	How many months working experience did you have between your first studies and the GA offer?	None	<12 months	12-24 months	> 24 months	
4	In terms of preparation for an academic career, was your working experience...	Sufficient?		Insufficient?		
5	State at which institution you did your undergraduate studies:					
6	What are your expected hours of work / daily attendance at Technikon - (either teaching or studying)	Mon : Wed : Fri : Other :	Tues : Thurs :			
7	Do you take the same holidays as academics?					
8	How much time per week do you spend on academic work at night / at weekends?					
9	What facilities are available for you? - Check all applicable blocks.					
	Own Desk	Own Computer	Shared Computer	No Computer Access		
	Own Bookcase	Own Office	Shared Office	Sufficient Stationery	Y	N
	Own Cupboard	Own Telephone	Shared Telephone	No access to telephone		
	Welcome in Staff Tea Room		Not encouraged to use Staff Tea Room			
10	Comment on Biographical details (see Questions 1 - 9 above) :					

SECTION 2 - DEPARTMENT RELATIONSHIPS

	What is your relationship with:	Very good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor
1	HOD					
2	Other staff					
3	Students					
4	Comments on Department Relationships:					

SECTION 3 - MENTORSHIP

1	Do you have a Departmental Mentor?	No	Yes	Name:
2	Do you have a Faculty Mentor?	No	Yes	Name:
3	Discuss the mentoring process: (success / potential / problems / recommendations)			

SECTION 4 - STAFF INDUCTION

1	Have you attended the Academic Staff Induction Programme?	Complete	Current	Not yet Started
2	Have you submitted a Portfolio?	Submitted	Working on it	Not yet Started
3	What was the most beneficial part of the induction process?			
4	What was the least beneficial part of the induction process?			
5	Did the orientation week assist you to identify with the Technikon?			

6	What did you learn about Quality Assurance in teaching?		
7	What teaching methods do you favour? Why? (Lecture / Demonstration / Group Work / Discussion / other:)		
8	What type of student performance assessment methods do you favour? Why?		
9	What do you understand about OBE:		
10	How well is OBE incorporated into your department?		
11	Have you undertaken a student evaluation of your performance?	Yes	No
	If Yes, please comment:		
12	Have you obtained any informal student feedback?	Yes	No
	If Yes, please comment:		
13	Have you undertaken a peer/staff evaluation of your performance?	Yes	No
	If Yes, please comment:		
14	Have you obtained any informal peer/staff feedback?	Yes	No
	If Yes, please comment:		
15	What do you think are the greatest rewards for an academic?		
16	What do you think are the greatest problems facing an academic?		

17	Indicate how competent you are at meeting the outcomes for the teaching portfolio		Competent	Almost competent	Not competent
	1	Designing a teaching programme			
	2	Using a wide range of teaching and learning strategies			
	3	Providing support to students in academic and pastoral matters			
	4	Using a wide range of assessment methods			
	5	Evaluating work with a range of self, peer and student monitoring			
	6	Performing effectively in teaching support and administrative matters			
	7	Developing professional and personal coping strategies			
	8	Gaining an appreciation of the particular educational concerns of your discipline			
	9	Reflecting on own personal and professional practice and making a plan for continuing professional development			
	10	Identifying and meeting departmental outcomes			
18	Comments on Staff Induction (Q1-17 above):				

SECTION 5 - DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES

1	What do you understand are the most important conditions / terms of your GA contract?					
2	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture..	Alone		With Supervision		Not allowed to lecture
	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture... (also indicate the number of periods per week for each category)	Theory	ppw	Practicals	ppw	Tutorials ppw
	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture..	First years		Second Years		Third Years
	With regard to lecturing, do you ...	Prepare lectures		Prepare tests & other assessments		Mark tests & other assessments

3	<p>List everything you are expected to do in your department. Try to allocate a percentage of your time to each task. (Use the hours indicated in Section 1 question 5 for guidance) Check YES if you think it is part of your contract, and NO if you think it is not part of your contract.</p>	% time	YES - part of my contract	NO - not part of my contract
	Teaching			
	Mentoring students			
	Studying towards own qualification			
	Preparation for teaching			
	Assessment of learning			
	Administrative work			
	Supervision of Students Experiential Training			
	Other: (please specify)			
	Other: (please specify)			
4	<p>List anything you are NOT doing now that you think you SHOULD be doing. Explain briefly:</p>			
5	<p>If you checked "No - not part of my contract" in Question 3 for anything, please explain briefly:</p>			
6	<p>What additional staff development / support factors would assist you to become a better academic? Check this list as ✓(received), X (not received), NA (not applicable), NN (not necessary).</p>			
	Coaching on how to deal with stress			
	More motivation and encouragement			
	Further assistance with teaching skills			
	Opportunity to gain additional industry experience			
	Coaching in academic writing skills			
	Coaching in how to deal with students			
	coaching in cultural sensitivity			
	Assistance with research skills			
	Opportunities to talk to other GA's			
	Coaching in time management skills			
	Coaching in communication skills			
	Coaching in computer skills (please specify)			
	Other (please specify)			

7	Comment on Duties and Responsibilities (Q1-6 above):

SECTION 6 - PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

1	What effect has the GA programme had on you as a person?		
2	What effect has the GA programme had in preparing you for a career as an academic?		
3	What effect has the GA programme had in preparing you for a career outside academia?		
4	Do you regard yourself as being more of a	lecturer	student
5	When you accepted the GA position, did you see it as a route to.....	becoming an academic	obtaining a post-graduate qualification
6	Comment on Personal Development (Q1-5 above):		

SECTION 7 - CONCLUSION

1	Has your contract been enjoyable? Briefly comment.		
2	Would you like to accept a lecturing post in your department? Briefly comment.		
3	What would you recommend to improve the concept of the GA programme?		
Would you like to participate in further discussions regarding this research?		YES	NO

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND CONTRIBUTION.

Dates of contract	07/00-06/02	04/00-12/01	01/00-12/01	07/99-06/01	03/99-12/00	02/99-12/00	01/99-12/00	07/98-12/00	02/98-12/00
No. of GA's	1	2	11	1	1	1	1	1	1
BTech 18					MTECH..... 2				

SECTION 1 - BIOGRAPHICAL

1	How long have you been a GA?		<1year 15	1-2 yrs 3	>2 yrs 2
2	How old are you?	No ans 1	<23yrs 7	23-25yrs 4	>25yrs 8
3	How many months working experience did you have between your first studies and the GA offer?	None 3	<12mth 6	12-24m 5	> 24m 6
4	In terms of preparation for an academic career, was your working experience...	No ans 2	Sufficient 10	Insufficient 7	Not ideal 1
5	State at which institution you did your undergraduate studies: Technikon Natal x16 Mangosuthu x1 Eastern Capex1 No answer x1 Unisa x1* (*+ Umlamli & Frere Hospitals)				
	S1-Q6 What are your expected hours of work / daily attendance at Technikon - (either teaching or studying)	S1-Q8 How much time per week do you spend on academic work at night / at weekends?	Th	Pr	TU
	32 *inc Sat 12ppw (Teaching)	4 2hrs/night+Sat	-	-	-
	30 28-30	2hrs/night 14	-	-	-
	37 44.5	3 11	5	5	-
	20-35 44	2 2	3	1	4
	25 30	14 30	6	-	6
	42.5 40	6 + when nec 10	-	7	-
	20 42.5	10 10	8	8	8
	40 40	40 not answered	-	-	12
	45.5 40	it depends 32	15	-	-
	24 + pracs/att BT 40 inc Sat 3hrs.	46 10-12hrs	2	6	-
			-	15	-
			-	-	-
			-	-	-
			12	-	-
			4	3	3
			12	-	-
			6	6	2
7	Do you take the same holidays as academics?			Yes:- 18	No:-2
9	What facilities are available for you?				
	Own Desk :- 19	Own Computer:- 11	Shared Computer:-8	No Computer Access: 1	
	Own Bookcase:-11	Own Office:-8	Shared Office:-8	Sufficient Stationery	No ans:1
				Y: 18	N: 1
	Own Cupboard:-9	Own Tel:12	Shared Telephone:7	No access to telephone:1	
	Welcome in Staff Tea Room:- 19		Not encouraged to use Staff Tea Room		No Ans: 1

10	<p>Comment on Biographical details (see Questions 1 - 9 above) :</p> <p>On Wed, Thurs I work half days because I have to go and research about my title for BTech and on Fridays I attend the induction classes from one o'clock to three o'clock. Saturdays I lecture students from the ** project for practice of the outcomes based education method of teaching.</p> <p>Regarding Q8 I'm not precisely just how much time do I spend on academic work (night/at weekends) since my work is mostly practical. I mostly manage to finish everything within the given time except where I need extra hours to finish off marking but it does not take really that much of my time since I sometimes get some assistants from my working colleagues.</p> <p>Six working hours are ideal for my studies since one has to be studying and site visits take up 40% of my study time. I make most of my appointments at the department phoning from the department or manual appointments early in the mornings with persons involved around the topic of my study. Lots of time is wasted around that. But with good organisation in my department it could be better for the students and myself.</p> <p>Tuesday evening 16:30 to 19:00 lecturing</p> <p>For question 3, what if I took up various jobs during my full time studies, do I then add all that up to determine how many years experience I have.</p> <p>My work as GA, is giving me enough time to prepare my studies, and the time I spent teaching is also enough for acquiring Experience and the 2 year period of GA prepares me well to become a lecturer even though in most cases lacks industry Experience. Facilities provided are basically the same as those of any other lecturers.</p> <p>I think it's very good for my department to have someone of my age because most of the staff members are due to retirement soon in a period which is less than 10yrs some <5yrs.</p> <p>Graduate assistants program is very helpful to students who want to further their studies and who are financially needing.</p> <p>I have to use temporary office space in the tea room.</p> <p>None</p> <p>I am welcomed in the staff Tea Room, the problem is, it is too far from where I am (the lab)</p> <p>*Q6 In our department semester courses demand that the student undergo Experiential training. This might end up spending hours at the employers location. Therefore our hours are flexible and one has to spend \pm 4 hrs at Tech.</p> <p>Only if we can get an additional computer, otherwise there are no other problems at work.</p> <p>None</p> <p>1998/9 I was tutoring Saturday school and involved in Winter School organized by Technikon Natal Students. Before commencing my studies I was a teacher at ** for one year. I am treated as a staff member and expected to act as every staff member does, spend time spent by every staff member in the Dept. I have too much work to do (my academic and student's). Usually I use nights and weekends to keep up with workload I have. So far the Dept has been supportive.</p> <p>This is my first year as a graduate assistant. I started as post graduate, with an experience of 12 years teaching ** in a college **, to me it was not a problem as such, moreover I am teaching post graduate students. Facilities in the department are adequate, and I get sufficient support. During the first year more time is spent on lesson preparation.</p> <p>My department is newly formed and growing therefore facilities are not abundant, yet it is impressive how everyone (those who are permanent staff) has been provided with their own space, this encourages one to feel like they belong in the department. I feel like a valued member of staff who contributes to my department. (Q3 - wrote 6 months work experience, but checked 'none'.)</p>	No answer: 3
----	---	--------------

SECTION 2 - DEPARTMENT RELATIONSHIPS

	What is your relationship with:		Very good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor
1	HOD	Excellent:-1	14	5			
2	Other staff		10½	7½	2		
3	Students		11	8	1		
4	Comments on Department Relationships:						No answer: 1
	Non						
	My relationship with the HOD and other staff members it's what really gives me courage and makes me become more and more positive on my work. They're very much supportive and I value that. Also with students I had not had any problems from my perspective thou they may see that other way around.						
	None						
	I feel welcome to my department, its just that everybody is busy, I don't get time to sit and chat with them. Thats why relationship is nutral.						
	Do not understand whether I'm fully integrated or not.						
	I wouldn't want to work anywhere else. The people I work with are most accommodating & welcoming & they are grooming me. I feel like I am part of a team here. They listen to my opinions & suggestions. And my boss treats me like he treats all the other staff.						
	As a Graduate Assistant I have been or feel I have been treated the same way as other members, and also feel like they value my contribution, so I don't really feel inferior and the relationship in general has been good.						
	1 staff is a problem to everyone not me only, to students, staff members. Of course I am the only black person in the department they(students) feel more comfortable talking to me. The relationship is very good but there are a few problems there and there but those are not daily things, they just happen sometimes. It depends on the lecturers some of them are 100% nice to students, other staff members on satelite campuses etc. Some of them are monsters.						
	We have a good relationship in the department. They treat me very well.						
	We work as a team, they also help me when encountering difficulties.						
	I have an excellent relationship with my colleagues they treat me so well that I don't even feel like a Grad-assistant but as one of the lecturers in this department. I'm very happy to be part of this team and they have been of great help / assistance to me even with my studies.						
	Senior lecturers in my department are always willing to help if I need assistance						
	I did experience some problems with the students not understanding my teaching strategy/approach. I called the meeting and established a record of understanding. Presently, our relations are quite good.						
	My relationship with other staff members and the HOD is very good, we seem to get along very well together. When I need help they are ever ready and willing to help not just only with academic work but also when I have personal problems. I think working with people I already knew since when I was a student made life easy for everyone.						
	Relationships with working colleagues is just good enough we respect each other and sometimes share the ideas. With the students I personally don't have a problem with them I am not too sure of their assessment.						
	Very professional and supportive - (real teamwork!!!)						
	I cannot explain the support I get from the Department - its excellent. I am very happy with the treatment I get and have come to realize that the treatment one is offered impacts on one's performance. With the support I get I'm willing to work even harder.						
	Relations are good.						
	We have an open door policy that is put into practise everyday. Yes there is a hierarchy yet our relationships in the department and with students are not controlled rigidly by them.						

SECTION 3 - MENTORSHIP

1	Do you have a Departmental Mentor?			No: 2	Yes: 18
2	Do you have a Faculty Mentor?	No: 11	Yes: 4	Yes (incorrect): 4	Yes (forgotten name): 1
3	Discuss the mentoring process:				One response = N/A
	Our process is normally done on one on one basis with the students where by the student is being called by the mentor to speak, to try to find out the difficulties they face within the department and not when they are at Tech so that we can help that someone and I work hand in hand with him to solve such problems.				
	Like all other department staff members, she's been very much supportive. Having the same person as my departmental and faculty mentor has given me a very big advantage. She has taught me a skill on how sometimes to overcome general problems that you may come across before they could even arise.				
	Since I got into being GA, I have not yet had any progress report from HOD and other staff.				
	Not much contact with mentors at this stage.				
	Suppose to meet daily to discuss current problems I face but instead only meet occasionally where there is a problem.				
	Mentoring offers a support structure that I need as a new academic recruit. I suppose it needs to be more systematic and structured, more outcomes-based. I think the faculty mentor needs to organise regular meetings (optional) for new staff to exchange and discuss their challenges in academia.				
	Our mentoring process has just begun, but there is a potential and I think it might work.				
	My departmental mentor is a very nice person who is always willing to help me with everything. Faculty mentor - I see no use of her at the moment. It will be better if she establishes a relationship with us and try and monitor our progress from time to time and pick us up when we fall.				
	** is very nice and helpful to me				
	Our department only started this year with this programme and its been fairly successful, besides problems there and there. The main problem we had was poor attendance and more especially during the second term. Students recommended it should only be conducted during the 1st semester and then maybe converted to Tutoring classes thereafter.				
	The process is a success. The problem is that my mentor is a hard to get person, otherwise he is very helpful				
	We discuss what is expected of me for the period & agree. I come up with a plan/strategy of how I'm going to do it. We further sit and discuss the plan. I do the implementation and results are collected. We discuss the results and make comments.				
	The mentoring process has been a success, since I have my HOD as mentor. Even though I had somebody else before assigned to me as a mentor, I never consulted with him/her. My HOD has been very supportive and I don't even think she knows that she's my mentor. I always consult with her when there are things I don't understand and she always makes time for me.				
	Success; no problems acquainted so far				
	So far we are still doing quite well. He gives me some advises here and there as well as giving me exposure and we respect each other.				
	The mentor programme definitely seeks to assist students academic success & psychological development by facilitating their adjustment into the Technikon, affording them the ability to read the culture of the campus. This is definitely achieved through a mentor as he/she creates a climate for "INTERCHANGE and INTERACTION". I highly recommend that all departments become ACTIVELY involve with this programme.				
	Mentoring process in the dept is excellent. Dept mentor is also sharing with me the subject I teach (team teaching). He helps me a lot with my studies (he is my supervisor for my research along with the HOD). Usually everyone in the Dept is involved in mentoring process -> team building workshop.				
	As per my request the mentoring is done by all the lecturers in the department. I requested this so that each individual lecturer can have an input, which I believe is not the same from each other.				
	The mentoring process is very successful because it is co-regulatory. We mentor each other coz we all have expertise and we recognise each individuals unique expertise.				

SECTION 4 - STAFF INDUCTION

1	Have you attended the Academic Staff Induction Programme?	No ans: 1	Complete: 10	Current: 7	Not yet Started 2
2	Have you submitted a Portfolio?	Submitted:0	Working on it: 11	Not yet Started : 9	
3	What was the most beneficial part of the induction process?		No answer: 1 / Two responses= N/A		
	It was when I could present and give out the intended outcome for the section.				
	To know what do they expect of me and some idea on how to achieve that.				
	Out Come's Based Education				
	Teaching skills and right assessment methods for students & motivation				
	Getting to know different methods of handling class discussions.				
	Provided me with various of improving teaching				
	Learning to talk in front of people, using different methods of teaching.				
	Learning about the teaching skills and students behaviour & reactions to certain things.				
	This is where I felt I was not alone & sharing views & ideas made my life easy.				
	I met a lot of people, shared ideas & appear t o be future references & source of info where I lack. It gave me a clear insight of what is happening around the Tech. Now I know what people are doing and where I can get help from fields, *** where I'm not a ... can't read.				
	Learning how to handle students and setting assignments.				
	Teaching & learning seminars. Orientation to T.N., my work area; team; goals of my department and of the institution.				
	I can not comment or say of the <u>most</u> since it is still on.				
	Learning about OBE, copywriting, different teaching styles, etc.				
	Shared experiences. New ideas of problem solving. Socializing.				
	OBE				
	Been part of the group and having a sense of shared anxiety and ??				
4	What was the least beneficial part of the induction process?		No answer: 6 / Two responses = N/A		
	To be honest none.				
	none				
	When we did the theories of learning				
	The OBE Theory why do we have to know it now??				
	Everything in the process was worth it & useful				
	I can't recall at this stage.				
	May by the end of it I'll be able to pick up the least.				
	Can't think of any.				
	None				
	The time slot of Friday afternoon!				

5	Did the orientation week assist you to identify with the Technikon?	No answer: 1/ Yes 8 / Two responses = N/A
	Yes. I've learnt things I wouldn't even bother to know if I was still a student.	
	Not that much from what I all-ready knew since I've been here from 97.	
	Most definitely, otherwise I don't think I would survive.	
	Not much - we only went to the library otherwise it was theory, theory, theory.	
	In my department, Yes. But in other sections, it seems something was lacking.	
	Yes, since I didn't attend orientation as a student.	
	Definitely, it made things much more clearer as what is expected & required.	
	Not much I had already been to the Tech for 3 years.	
	Not really coz I'm already very familiar with Tech.	
6	What did you learn about Quality Assurance in teaching?	No answer: 7 / Two responses = N/A
	I learnt that to be a good teacher you have to be able to move from known to unknown and someone whose willing to research and come up with new strategies of teaching and learning.	
	It prepares a learner for the real world (very much beneficial)	
	That most academics aren't yet embracing OBE quality standards.	
	That there are std's to abide by & maintain.	
	A good teacher is a teacher who continuously assess students not to wait for day of a test.	
	No	
	It is important as in any other field. It keeps changing to meet with the demands.	
	The quality of what we teach is important and must also be recognised internationally in order to produce internationally competent students.	
	Quality in a Technikon Programme - can be assessed by the number of employable or self-employed students produced by the programmes. Also the demand of programmes offered by the Technikon in the industrial world. Quality of a lecturer's work - assessed by the level of improvements by the students, also feedback from students (tests, assignments, practicals, tutorials etc), staff assessment & student as well as self evaluation.	
	Ensuring high standards of teaching in the Technikon	
	I can't remember terminology like that but if it means constantly been aware and revamping and examining our teaching practise to ensure it has the highest for the students then I learned TN vision for ensuring quality.	

7	What teaching methods do you favour? Why?
	I would go for all of them because we tend to use them all in my department
	Demonstration and group work. If you mostly do practical you sometimes have to explain briefly or demonstrate so that your learners will know the standard that you expect from them. With group work you find different good ideas give good results.
	Group Work / Discussion
	Lecture, demonstrations, group work and tutorials.
	Group Work, Discussion.
	It depends on the module that I am teaching. If the module requires any / some or all of the above, I incorporate that into the teaching and learning. Active learning is the key.
	Discussion: because it allows a student to put his own view on the matter and it is easier to remember and understand the topic, if you participate on discussion.
	Lecture I only teach computers so I introduce the work then make the students do the practicals and check how they are doing.
	Combination of lecture and group work
	Group work; since I am only doing tutorials.
	Lecture and demonstration - the subject matter that I lecture requires more practice and demonstration of things. It is a very practical subject.
	Other:- Factory Visits. Discussion. Here students open up & I assist them in whatever way I can. It also makes me want to know more eg: if a problem has occurred I have to do research & come up with answers for/to students.
	The method is situational. In our case, we do demonstrations for practicals and lecture the theory part. Group work seems not to work in bigger groups due to the time constraints, in this assignment done in groups would seem more favourable.
	1. Lecture: since I can teach and observe the reaction of the students and also ask questions some time <u>and</u> 2. Groupwork: this helps to see who can work well without the facilitator and also help learners express themselves freely.
	Demonstration; Groupwork or discussion - sitting still in class listening to one person talking tends to bore students; whereas open / visual methods everybody co-operates.
	I like demonstration where it is possible because it is more practical. Secondly I prefer to use any suitable method for the subject and the students.
	I try to use and explore different teaching styles but enjoy giving demonstration accompanied with a lecture, as I have found that students learn faster by visual teaching followed by a brief discussion. (It all depends on the subject matter you teach either a prac / theory.)
	All of the above. I think they are all good when applied effectively, and they are required equally for a complete teaching exercise. Lecture - students believe that the lecturer is the best source of knowledge-> they tend to rely on lecturing. Students rely most on being lectured and guided especially 'new students' ie first years. Therefore lecturing is a good support system to get them to settle in a new setting (Tertiary institution) Demonstration - students like to connect what they learnt in theory to a practical situation. Is important to link theory to a practical - usually demonstration of what was learnt in theory makes the subject become a real situation - practical experience is important. Groupwork - sharing of ideas amongst students is important - it allows students to know each other better and develop other skills viz: time management, responsibility etc. Discussion - students share ideas - develop skills: communication, presentation skills, effective debating of ideas.
	Groupwork, Discussion
	Groupwork and Discussion. Fits in with my understanding of how 'learning' should be facilitated as well as the subject I facilitate lends itself to the practical aspect that needs to be completed by students.

8	What type of student performance assessment methods do you favour? Why?	No answer: 3
	Have an individual report sheet for each student	
	Assignments, Tests (practical test) They students to understand ** Excercise - concepts better.	
	Role-play. It gives student opportunity to apply what they've learnt in practice.	
	Practical assignments, case studies for practise, & tests for theory related parts of the syllabus. These techniques are Outcomes Based.	
	I think test evaluation sort of measures much does a student know or understand.	
	Exercises everyday or worksheets because you can see if the students did understand the work or not.	
	Control tests - Because you are sure that the student has done it by himself or herself.	
	Testing, they give clear indication of what they have achieved from lecturing or lectures.	
	The one that is currently being used. It help you to improve and change whatever you are not doing right. You get to know your weaknesses and improve on them.	
	Assignments. They give students a chance to find out more about the topics thus helping them even more than you will give them.	
	Practical performance = students apply knowledge practically by performing technique (This is a requirement in industry = hands on). For theory = I give tutorials (continuous assessment) and tests and assignments.	
	Test: even though it is difficult to mark and time consuming, test can show / tell who understands well and you can also pick up the things they didn't understand from failing certain sections of the test.	
	In groupworks; practical & assignments peer assessment is the best cause they are the ones who know the contribution of each member to the group work.	
	Their own self assessment first and I can make my own.	
	Oral presentation - it is easy to communicate ideas than to write them down, it serves time anmd minimize errors (spelling), some handwritings are hard to read which may be 'disturbing', it allows for clarification of points which may not be possible to put down in pen. Tests - it has been in use in the Technikon and (formal) other teaching institution. Continuous assessment vs Year-end exams - I tend to prefer continous assessment to year-end exams, year-end exams allow for route learning which does not reflect what the student knows and can do. Assignments - are very good in that students research information and read more to get the required information, assignments allow the lecturer to stipulate the number of readings a student will require and give references so that the information is made available to students to read for themselves, this allows for students to be responsible, allow students to gather as much info as they can without being limited by what the lecturer knows -> does not depend on lecturers knowledge.	
	Continous evaluation, because loop holes can be identified early and remedied.	
	I prefer a range: Peer evaluation, on site supervisor evaluation, my evaluation and self evaluation. This gives a more holistic picture.	

9	What do you understand about OBE:	No answer: 1
	It's a set of outcomes that have to be reached on a fixed amount of time.	
	Present the problem to your student, find out how much information they have about it and then develop their knowledge from there.	
	Setting specific target with in given time frame.	
	Computer teaching lends itself to OBE.	
	New system of learning and teaching that emphasise that student be told beforehand assessment criteria and methods to be used to assess them.	
	It's where, after you have taught students concepts, you allow them to show what they know and can do, by altering your lecturing accordingly.	
	Outcomes Base Education: my understanding is very limited but I think it all about teaching what is suppose to be gain of teaching subject in a manner that shows student results.	
	Outcomes Based Education. Making sure that a student is capable of <u>doing</u> something after completing first year, then second year & third year.	
	Nothing much.	
	Nothing.	
	That it gives the student a chance to be independent & the lecturer guides them to the right way/channel.	
	Outcomes Based Education. It is the actual demonstration in an authentic context.	
	Students are assessed on what they know leaving a room to develop them fully until they understand the concept "subject contents"	
	OBE is the result based process of learning; where what a learner can do; knows; understand as well as his/her outlook & attitudes are adressed.	
	It is an outcome based type of educating, whereby one has to be quite sure and give the outcome of a lesson prior to the delivery.	
	OBE allows students to be actively engaged in their learning thereby at preparing them to meet the demands of industry. It also allows staff together with students to take full responsibility for successful learning.	
	Outcomes based education. Outcomes need to be spelt out clearly to learners. Learners should at the end of the learning event be able to say the outcomes were achieved.	
	Learning everyday in the real life context. Learner centred. Outcome based - developing learners -> outcomes.	
	Outcomes Based Education. Looking at the outcome of our courses that we offer and relevanting them, making them current and relevant to the profession.	

10	How well is OBE incorporated into your department?			No answer: 2
I would say the progress grows on the daily bases because each and every day in the department there are some outcomes that are meet by the students.				
Everyone is in support of OBE.				
Very well especially (CAD) Computer Aided Design. It is effective.				
Its being introduced.				
Fairly well but still in the process of fully integrating it.				
Very well, but the concept is new so there is still that uncertainty especially with the media debates going on, but my colleague are well-informed.				
I think so.				
To me we are actually using OBE because of the nature of our subjects. Students will be able to **etc.				
I am not sure				
N/A				
I would say very well especially when they do Food Projects III.				
The department is trying its best.				
Our department is in the process of implementing OBE, its not easy but I can see it working and I have noticed a change of attitude from students, they also seem to enjoy it.				
It has been initiated.				
We have just started with the OBE programme and the very first steps were producing study guides directed towards OBE. Lectures / practicals are also slowly directed towards OBE -(esp our BTECH year - very OBE orientated)				
Mt dept is a pilot Dept for OBE implementation. At the moment the dept is busy with modularisation. I can say OBE is well incorporated into my Dept.				
It is well co-operated - because continuous assessment is done.				
Very well. We've been offering outcome programmes for about \pm 3 yrs.				
11	Have you undertaken a student evaluation of your performance?	Yes : 10	No: 10	No answer: 7
It could be improved				
I made students to write on a piece of paper what they learnt and what they would like to do to improve.				
It's valuable to me, to know whether I'm good or not.				
I came to understand the areas where I need to improve my teaching skills.				
N/A				
Very happy about the outcome, there was one thing that I had to be careful of, otherwise Good.				
The first one gave favourable results. The second one was very negative, resolutions were made and I am implementing own strategy.				
It was done by the HOD, I don't know what students said about me.				
It went fairly well. Results were favourable.				
I learnt a lot from the student evaluation. I considered their remarks & hope they developed me.				
They were so please, because an OBE approach is creative, stimulate thinking.				
What has happened is an informal evaluation through discussion btw HOD and my students, positive feedback.				

12	Have you obtained any informal student feedback?	Yes: 13	No: 7	No answer: 8
	They feel I should be more involved in preparation of project given in department.			
	Feedback positive.			
	In term of wanting to understand whether what I told them make sense at all.			
	I'm for students participating in their own learning.			
	They actual came to approve of my teaching method by participating as oppose to when they were not.			
	"Miss, I wish you could take us for all our subjects, you are always so caring" This was great.			
	The students are acknowledging my flexibility and changes in the approach.			
	Some students brought to my attention things I thought they were not important.			
	Students comments were informative & helpful in terms of my teaching style.			
	I keep getting informal stud. feedback on every meetings we have. I'm continuously dev. to a better person.			
	Students were positive about me teaching them.			
	See above (What has happened is an informal evaluation through discussion btw HOD and my students, positive feedback)			
13	Have you undertaken a peer evaluation of your performance	Yes: 8	No: 11	No answer:11
	When I was attending induction programme I had to do a presentation which my peers did evaluation on me and they gave me some ideas on how to face diff. challenges.			
	Positive feedback			
	I made a presentation in front of colleagues and they commented on my shortcomings and praised.			
	Valuable information.			
	Everything went well, she was happy with my work			
	They were impressed by my presentation and they liked my style.			
	My HOD was satisfied with my performance level as a GA.			
	My HOD used to sit in at all my lectures for the whole of last semester making remarks in a handbook which she gave to me after class.			
	Errors during my lessons were rectified.			
14	Have you obtained any informal peer/staff feedback?	Yes 11	No 9	No answer:10
	They'll sometimes identify may weakness and then help me to work on that.			
	The feedback was positive & encouraging.			
	Through the performance of my student.			
	" ** you are doing an excellent job we are very proud of you" I get these almost everyday.			
	Happy with my work			
	It was by my HOD. It's when I have done something and she comments on it ie setting test papers.			
	Always guided and advised on my teaching styles & methods.			
	The HOD and myself were engaged in team teaching for the whole of last semester. She would sit at the back of the class taking notes of my presentation and record remarks on a handbook which she handed to me after the lecture. She would also remark verbally on our way back to the dept. At times she would fill in an assessment form and hand it to me afterwards. She would ask me to feel free to comment on comments she put in the handbook.			
	This is a continuous process facilitated by discussing and brainstorming our teaching practice.			

15	What do you think are the greatest rewards for an academic?	No answer: 2
	It's when you achieve your intended outcomes based on what ever subject you've been teaching.	
	Learn how to deal and work with people from different backgrounds and seeing just how important your work is.	
	Learning new things every day.	
	Flexibility of working hours. (I, enjoy passing knowledge to people.	
	Free - opportunity to study, good feelings about having moved student from point of not knowing to knowing.	
	When your students move through the years, graduate & start working, & you know you were part of that.	
	You learn everyday and there is always room for improvement, and you always want to try new ideas.	
	Excellent salary, a good image, a role model to your community, always challenged to learn, & to update your knowledge.	
	You have spare time during the day.	
	Updated economically	
	Is to help students i.e. pass info / knowledge that will give them a "tomorrow" (future)	
	One is always learning new things from the people you meet and is kept update with inventions.	
	Study opportunities and self development through studying and doing research so as to acquire more knowledge.	
	To be up to date in terms of knowledge and academic.	
	To share my knowledge of what I have achieved (research) with others, thereby preparing myself to always aim for greater heights. Allowed me to develop and improve on teaching and learning skills.	
	To be able to develop academically. No limits to studying. Endless chances of developing also as a person.	
	Promotion. Motivation.	
	Facilitating growth of a student, whether it be emotional or academic and watching them blossom as people.	

16	What do you think are the greatest problems facing an academic?			No answer: 1	
	It's when you have to make up time even after hours in order for you to help the student's to archive or reach the intended destination.				
	When people do not think that you're capable and don't want to accept you.				
	Transparency and openness when it comes to OBE.				
	Students who refuse to work, students who dont attend lectures and students who dont have respect.				
	Tight schedules, marking,				
	Diversity and language proficiency problems, the quality of students we admit.				
	I think it would be the loss of good lecturers to industry, because of Pay and Packages (Q15 G8) offered by industry as compare to institution (Academic)				
	- Dropping number of students coming to technikons (high failure rate/AIDS). - Merger.				
	They need high level of interpersonal skill, to be informed about things happening around and to be role model for students.				
	I don't know any yet.				
	In this department it might be lack of what is currently happening in the industry. They need to keep up with the latest trends in the ** Industry.				
	The problem is time. An academic has a time limit on lectures=> they can't go into detail in some aspects.				
	You have to be on your toes, keep up with new changes and standards. Be a hard worker and sometimes make some compromises.				
	Not understanding students and not knowing enough on the subject you are lecturing as that might limit your ability to answer students questions				
	So far I don't have any but I think to lose the confidence from the students might be one of the problems				
	The fear of not fulfilling the role as an" ACADEMIC" or anything that might hinder this process.(RESEARCH.)				
	Working everytime, Endless/non-stop challenges at work and home. I don't see it as a problem now that I've accepted that its part of an academic. There's a lot of work that not every Jack & Jill can withstand, but all the same it's interesting.				
	If understanding of OBE is not the same with other staff personnel.				
	The uncertainty of jobs with the whole merger and having little control over their position				
17	Indicate how competent you are at meeting the outcomes for the teaching portfolio		Competent	Almost competent	Not competent
	Designing a teaching programme		5	11	4
	Using a wide range of teaching and learning strategies		9	9	2
	Providing support to students in academic and pastoral matters		13	6	1
	Using a wide range of assessment methods		6	12	2
	Evaluating work with a range of self, peer and student monitoring		5	14	1
	Performing effectively in teaching support & administrative matters		9	9	2
	Developing professional and personal coping strategies		9	8	1
	Gaining an appreciation of the particular educational concerns of your discipline		8	7	3
	Reflecting on own personal and professional practice and making a plan for continuing professional development		7	11	1
	Identifying and meeting departmental outcomes		12	8	

18	Comments on Staff Induction (Q1-17 above):	No answer: 5
	I found it very much useful especially if you're a new staff member. You learn about the mission statement and what is expected of you	
	One should first complete an induction course and have the full co operation of the departments.	
	I have learnt a lot during my time.	
	The induction program is still going on and it is quite beneficial to us in term equipping us to deal different situation in the lecturing field. Most of the methods suggested by the programme are pretty much relevant and attempt to implement them on every encounter.	
	The programme overall is an excellent problem, but I think that meetings should be organised at least once a semester for the 2 years of new recruits to find out what others are doing right or wrong.	
	I have just started attending induction, so not much comment can be provided at this point, but it seems to be working and it also helpful in identifying problem areas in teaching.	
	They should only deal with the above ten topics in details so that we are able to meet all these requirements stated above.	
	Not yet attended any induction programme. Not yet started teaching ?	
	I have the ability to connect my performance with understanding so I can learn from my actions and adapt to unpredictable circumstances.	
	Staff induction was very helpful to me. At times I used to wonder why people use different lecturing techniques and also why students lose concentration but through induction most of my questions were answered and I now know the do's and don'ts of lecturing.	
	Staff induction is useful because it is where we are thought of what is happening in the field. Ideas are shared and improvements to be made are easily identifiable and so are the teaching and learning up to date tips.	
	Some of the questions especially Q17 is a very loathing (??) Since as GA's with no previous experience, it is difficult to answer questions that still requires us to learn and improve and thereafter to reach some level of competency.	
	I found a teaching programme in place and have been using it. I have not yet designed mine but I am confident that when time asks for mine I'll be ready. Although I use a wide range of assessment methods, I'm not confident yet to say I'm competent. I'm still working on it.	
	Not sure about staff induction before 2000. At the moment the Quality teaching unit is conducting workshops in my department about OBE approach.	
	Very valuable Project. It is a support system for staff who have little or no academic background in terms of lecturing.	

SECTION 5 - DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES

1	What do you understand are the most important conditions / terms of your GA contract? No answer: 1			
	(1) Development of the students from disadvantaged backgrounds. (2) Academic induction.			
	On this issue mostly your HOD notify you on the important conditions, even the contract states that it will be within your department on what work do they want you to do.			
	To gain working experience in that field.			
	Complete B-Tech in 2 years. Satisfy students and sufficient time with them. Attend all induction programmes.			
	I must pass my studies and must be able to lecture and always be available to assist wherever possible.			
	(i) Scholarship clause - that if I leave the Technikon before the end of contract, I will have to repay the money. (ii) I need to improve my qualifications as we go along.			
	To conduct lectures as required by my department and assist students with difficulties and also help with departmental work, same like every lecturer in the department. To do well in my studies.			
	Finish my BTech within 2 years. Permanent post is not guaranteed after 2 years. This is a frustrating one and demotivating.			
	Conduct lectures and tutorials and then to finish my BTech			
	To achieve academic progression and to be well prepared for the job I will take after the contract.			
	Have to study B-Tech or M-Tech. - Two year contract - Not entitled to all the benefits of the academic staff.			
	Is to have the ability to perform every task that is expected from me by the Department.			
	To have 12 lecturing period a week, do some admin work and also research through my studies.			
	Successful teaching performance. My academic record.			
	That I must always be available and provide help to my students when they need me.			
	RESEARCH- which must be completed before the end of my contract.			
	My academic performance must be good (ie I must progress & not be a drop out due to failure) I must lecture a min of 12 periods / week. This means I must seek to balance my academic performance with lecturing.			
	Teaching (facilitating) learning of students. Doing other administrative work.			
	That it is a kind of bursary that is valid for 2yrs. Payment is basically to cover living and books payment. Not a passport into fulltime lecture position but can enhance chances.			
2	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture..	Alone: 11 and 4x½	With Supervision: 5 and 4x½	Not allowed to lecture: 0
	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture...	Theory: 12	Practicals: 12	Tutorials: 9
	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture..	First years: 17	Second Years: 9	3rd yr: 1 4th yr: 1
	With regard to lecturing, do you ...	Prepare lectures: 18	Prepare test / other assessment: 14	Mark tests & other assessments: 15

3	List everything you are expected to do in your department. Try to allocate a percentage of your time to each task. (Use the hours indicated in Section 1 question 5 for guidance) Check YES if you think it is part of your contract, and NO if you think it is not part of your contract.	YES - part of my contract	NO - not part of my contract
	Teaching	20	
	Mentoring students	17	2
	Studying towards own qualification	20	
	Preparation for teaching	19	
	Assessment of learning	15	2
	Administrative work	14	3
	Supervision of Students Experiential Training	6	7
	Other: (please specify) Project running, Projects, Secretarial, CareersFair etc	1	2
4	List anything you are NOT doing now that you think you SHOULD be doing:	No answer: 8	
	Being part of problem solving and being involved in the report back of students that are not doing well.		
	Evening classes, but I don't think I could handle that.		
	The lecturers, they give me more than enough to do.		
	N/A		
	Assessment of learning, lecturing, attending induction programmes but I will do them next year.		
	N/A		
	Supervision of students ET: not done yet. I did a little bit of it last year checking on 2nd & 3rd yr, I think there is more than this.		
	How is this going to help your research??? On what basis is this question based???		
	Setting examinations for the students I teach.		
	N/A		
5	If you checked "No - not part of my contract" in Question 3 for anything, explain briefly:	No answer: 10	
	The students I teach are from other departments and those from my dept are second years they don't undertake exp. training.		
	These functions are there for my further development & helping out in the depart.		
	Admin work - it more academic side than administration work. Exp training - we do not provide in our department.		
	There is a person in this department who is specially employed and paid for experiential training only.		
	N/A		
	Admin work is done by our secretary		
	Experiential training is done in the industry out of the campus.		
	Mentoring of students is done on a voluntary basis. Others may not be part of my contract; but is still done voluntarily.		
	Mentoring students is not stipulated in my contract but I do it anyway. My door is always open for students to come for help. Students use the opportunity I offer them and I am happy about that.		
	The supervision of experiential training is done by someone responsible for it only.		

6	What additional staff development / support factors would assist you to become a better academic? Check this list as ✓(received), X (not received), NA (not applicable), NN (not necessary).	✓	X	NA	NN
	Coaching on how to deal with stress	3	10	1	5
	More motivation and encouragement	14	3		3
	Further assistance with teaching skills	16	4		
	Opportunity to gain additional industry experience	6	12	1	1
	Coaching in academic writing skills	4	14		1
	Coaching in how to deal with students	13	2		4
	Coaching in cultural sensitivity	6	7	1	6
	Assistance with research skills	10	10		
	Opportunities to talk to other GA's	10	6		4
	Coaching in time management skills	8	6	1	4
	Coaching in communication skills	11	6		3
	Coaching in computer skills	9	4	2	3
7	Comment on Duties and Responsibilities (Q1-6 above): No answer: 3 / one response = N/A				
	In terms of time allocation I had to put on extra hours for my own sake so that I can learn all the necessary do and don't and be able to adapt in my dept.				
	** demonstration lectures, preparing exercise for tuts/practicals **.				
	At times I don't clearly understand whether I do what is right because there is no constant feedback from the dept				
	I'm happy with my duties and responsibilities that I am growing as an academic.				
	I think my duties and responsibilities are very clear to me and I am able to carry them.				
	There is a confusion as to whether I should help the departmental secretary or I am assistant to lecturers only				
	I am very happy with what I am doing.				
	I cope with my duties and responsibilities without any pressure. I do them on time.				
	In the beginning I could not cope with my duties until I found a system of allocating time to each and every task and not giving priority to one thing.				
	I am solely responsible for the courses that I am lecturing. This gives me room to be independent, responsible and accountable. I like that!				
	So far I'm happy with what I'm doing since I'm doing different things that require thinking and also understanding of what you are doing.				
	So far I am still coping with the duties I am doing.				
	The relevancy of certain questions in terms of your research (Q4,5, 6) How does it contribute to your research & what are you trying to achieve via these questions???				
	I would like to have a mentor responsible for my entire period as a graduate assistant.				
	All that bothers me is that GA's do not have an official job description. This could be problematic to some GA who are not in supportive depts.				
	I have access to all the above (Q6) in my dept. The challenge is for me to make the best use of them to my best ability. My dept. staff is willing and able to help me in anything that's gonna bring the best out of me and I'm happy about it. (Q2) The whole of last semester I was teaching with supervision from my HOD. This semester I am teaching alone but still in the team teaching with the lecturer that was taking the subject last year. I still liase with him and he is there when I have a problem. Students are aware that should they not understand what I teach to them, the other lecturer is there to explain better. My other duties as a GA: to fill for any lecturer that may not be available for some reasons - to take students to field trips if it does not clash with my classes. All in all, to be of help / assistance to all lecturers in the Dept.				

SECTION 6 - PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

1	What effect has the GA programme had on you as a person?
	It has given me an opportunity to prove my self that I can do it meaning I can become a good teacher it's only a matter of time.
	Taught me to see how important and serious lecturing work is.
	It gave me a chance of perfecting my skills on my field of design.
	I have learnt alot on GA programme (** and technical skills)
	It enriched me immensely. It developed and moulded me into a better person in future by knowing my strengths
	Because I was a student here before, I have come to understand student issues.
	I feel like, I have developed academically and that what I have learned before, I can use my best of my ability.
	My peers respect me they see me as a role model, I now regard my self as an important person to other peoples lifes (students)
	It has shown me how does Technikon Natal care about their students.
	Motivate me into further studies.
	Gained more confidence in myself, enjoyed doing something more challenging, more motivating and gaining more knowledge at the same time.
	It has taught me to organise & structure everything so that it becomes meaningful to another person.
	It matched well with my personality and I foresee myself gaining knowledge and be amongst institutional 'guru's'.
	It has raised lots of questions as to what I really want in life and am I really ready to face the world but "I think I have developed"
	It meant more responsibility as I'm also responsible in assisting other students through.
	That I am half academic.
	Has definitely improved my communication skills and my confidence. Allows me to always improve and reach for greater heights. Enlightened me on the workings within Technikon Natal.
	It has developed me a great deal. I have realized so many things about myself ie I can withstand pressure, be responsible, make wise descisions.
	Too demanding, and my responsibility in my books (studying) is somehow decreasing.
	I have come to enhance and develop skills eg computer that I was not aware of and gained confidence in myself.
2	What effect has the GA programme had in preparing you for a career as an academic?
	It has a very big impression because the training you go through as a G.A. it builds you up for the future.
	How important it is to be up-dated and find all necessary information you can use to develop a learning programme.
	It opened my eyes on difficulties experienced by staff and student alike.
	Success
	Almost given me all the necessary skills and know how's of how to be a better facilitator.
	Tremendous because after this I will have 2 years experience & a BTECH
	I think, it has provided a great foundation for me to carry on as an academic
	Quite well I can see that I will be an excellent lecturer only if I get the chance to be one.
	It opened my eyes to see where I belong
	Exposure to my academic work.

	Helped me further my studies and my career.
	It has given me the ability to arouse students interest and hold their attention.
	Sometimes it makes you feel small - GA - you can't even mention it to outsiders.
	It has highlighted my strengths and weaknesses and opened my eyes as to what lecturing is all about
	I'd say it has already made me an academic-in-training as I receive guidance when I need it, as well as the opportunity to study towards my own qualification.
	It give me the hope that one day I will a fulltime facilitator.
	Enlightened me of what is required and expected of any academic - (hardwork, motivation, independency, confidence etc in terms of being a researcher)
	It has opened chances for me to academically develop. It has offered me a chance to rub shoulders with knowledgable people around the Technikon and that has boosted my confidence a great deal.
	Good
	Don't know if it is any in our dept but there is no such thing as a pure academic everyone has to multitask in order to run the dept successfully.
3	<p>What effect has the GA programme had in preparing you for a career outside academia? None=3</p> <p>Skill wise I'm setten that I can do better even if I base my self in community development skims SMME etc.</p> <p>How serious you must take your work no matter what you do. Different methods of finding information.</p> <p>** support and team leading / work</p> <p>Positive spill-over effects</p> <p>Well, I'm picking a lot of skills like time mgt, meetings training, so it is preparing me.</p> <p>As I am based in ** field, once you are teaching the subject, you tend to understand much better than learning, so I feel like I would cope.</p> <p>I'm spoiled other things they no longer interest me that much I just want to educate the nation</p> <p>It opened more chances for me, since I can work for an industry and also I can continue as an academic.</p> <p>More chances of getting a job next year.</p> <p>It has given me the opportunity to understand what & why one is doing something.</p> <p>Not known yet! It is unclear how other academics view GA programmes. Failure to get a job at Tech Natal could be viewed by outsiders as poor performance.</p> <p>At this stage I cannot tell because I don't have enough experience in the ** industry.</p> <p>I think the programme will boost my experience in terms of confidence, the ability to pass on knowledge & face challenges.</p> <p>It does not have much effect outside since most of the people outside the acadimic world are not aware of.</p> <p>I feel better equipped to face the world outside Tech. The programme has offered me a chance to go attend workshops / conferences & meetings outside Tech. This has offered me a chance to meet people outside academia.</p> <p>Good</p> <p>People outside tend to take notice when I mention that (I) can facilitate training courses effectively.</p>
4	<p>Do you regard yourself as being more of a</p> <p>lecturer: 13 & 4 x ½</p> <p>student: 3 and 4 x ½</p>
5	<p>When you accepted the GA position, did you see it as a route to....</p> <p>becoming an academic: 14 & 2 x ½</p> <p>obtaining a post-graduate qualification: 4 & 2x½</p>

6	<p>Comment on Personal Development (Q1-5 above):</p> <p>No answer: 3</p> <p>At first I was lost what to do or where to start but as time went on and on I grew stronger and started to realise that I'm no longer a normal student but a Junior lecturer.</p> <p>With regard to question 4 & 5 I would say that as a kind of person whose always willing to learn and then pass on the knowledge and that's the reason why I respond positively.</p> <p>With more skill development invest on me eg AUTO CAD and managerial skills</p> <p>I have grown and learnt more to take responsibilities as a lecturer, to lead a group of people and to have them counting on me.</p> <p>The program is good, it acts as a building block for those who wants.</p> <p>I'm happy with how I'm developing personally.</p> <p>I am now on my second year B.tech degree ** and it seems that my Experience as GA has prepared me for whatever is next.</p> <p>I have learnt a lot about lecturing since I have started working.</p> <p>I am more disciplined now and I also do well my pre-requisition of becoming a lecturer</p> <p>I regard myself as a student because the 2years the I've served as a GA has given me the opportunity to learn a lot about responsibilities in life.</p> <p>I would appreciate it if one can be supported by Tech to develop skills you think will benefit the students eg there were no funds to support my MBA studies and Tech couldn't assist. I was going to help students develop into being employees rather than job seekers.</p> <p>Academically, I think I have developed but I strongly believe there is room for improvement, there are things I still have to work on.</p> <p>Before I was a student and now that I am half student half academic my behaviour has to be adjusted somehow especially from that of a poor student.</p> <p>[There is definitely more room for improvement ..(**deleted)]</p> <p>I am confident that I can handle any situation now. Whether it be academic or in a work situation. I feel equipped. I have realised that I still want to develop my qualification -> may be become a Dr one day.</p> <p>Experience has been gained in an institution of higher learning, and I hope this has prepared me to lecture anywhere as an academic if I so wish.</p> <p>Been a GA has definitely enhanced my self-esteem as a competent, resourceful and efficient young woman.</p>
---	---

SECTION 7 - CONCLUSION

1	Has your contract been enjoyable? Briefly comment.
	So far I've enjoyed my contract because each day I learn new things about myself and my work and the environment I'm in pulls me towards achieving my goals.
	Yes, though at times it's a bit difficult when I have my studies to do and my duties to carry out, as they say 'life is not a bed of roses'
	Has been OK but not great.
	Yes I enjoy my contract in terms of lecturing but in terms of studying it is quite difficult to do my projects
	Not quite always but I manage to keep moving.
	Yes, I've met and hope to meet a lot of interesting people, and I'm thoroughly enjoying my stay here.
	Absolutely: I have been able to learn a lot through the post while also able to pursue my studies, so the work is good flexible time and good conditions of the contract, the pay, probably not so good in your second year.
	Yes I enjoy every day when I come to work it is always interesting and challenging and I learn new things everyday thanks to My HOD for always being so caring.
	Yes, I was called to start working later than I was supposed to, through personnel department.
	Yes, we work as a team here.
	Very enjoyable, even though I wish it was longer.
	Yes, very much so.
	No. A lot of risk is involved. There is no guarantee that you will get a permanent post at Tech; while companies outside offer attractive positions.
	A lot. I've learned different things, learning to work with people your age and also with older people teaching me the do's and don'ts in the lecturing world.
	Up to now.
	So far it has although I am still looking forward for more experience.
	Yes, stemming straight from student life into a GA post has definitely allowed me to see things from both sides (as a student & now a lecturer) thereby allowing me to fulfill the terms of my contract at a much better position (professional)
	Excellent!! My contract has been more than I anticipated. Besides the workload, the treatment I've got so far has been excellent. This has increased my interest of lecturing.
	No. Under pressure, not knowing whether I was doing the right thing. Not being sure whether I'll be taken next year.
	Yes. I have worked in one of the most evolving departments with multitude of changes which has kept me on my toes. Adaptation has been my forte.
2	Would you like to accept a lecturing post in your department? Briefly comment.
	Yes, because I am aptly equipped with the skills and standards of a good lecturer and I know the needs of the dep.
	Being with the kinds of people that I work with at the moment (supportive and courageous), I would.
	Yes but after I had enough experience.
	Yes I enjoy lecturing and developing students' knowledge.
	Yes, if they feel I meet their standard or given proper guidance where I experience a problem
	Yes, I'm enjoying what I'm doing, if one comes up I would do anything to get it.
	Yes I would, because I now feel like part of the department and I have learnt so much, in terms of teaching, preparing and assessing.
	With all my heart. I am the only black person in the department black students also need someone to talk to about everything.
	Yes, that is what I am hoping for, since I enjoy so much to be a lecturer especially in my department.

	Yes, because I like academic work due to it's update me a lot.
	Yes after gaining more industrial experience as this career require more / strong industrial experience.
	Yes. I have learnt to love lecturing but will also like to work in the industry so as to gain more knowledge.
	Yes. I would be delighted. I think I have a lot to offer to the students, dept, Tech and the community at large.
	Yes, I think I come too far to give up lecturing now and I would like to be part & parcel in developing students.
	Yes; it is my vision but in time when I am confident enough or with the necessary skills.
	That I would love. As I have mentioned before given more chance I think I can make a good lecturer.
	Most definitely 'Yes' - my professional relationship with other staff especially my HOD (support) has definitely allowed me to enjoy the work I do.
	With pleasure. I wouldn't feel like a new person or an outsider but a family member. I feel equipped for challenges in the profession of academia.
	No
	Yes. Preferably after I have taken a break and expanded myself elsewhere then come back.
3	What would you recommend to improve the concept of the GA programme? No answer: 4
	I think the change of the name Graduate Assistants would give us respect if they can call us Junior Lecturers so that the student will understand the difference between them and you.
	All the GA to be given the opportunity by their respective departments to prove themselves whether their are capable or not. I know of someone who actually came and talked with me of a difficulty he's having and it's sad.
	Need to have a clear documented programme that stipulates the exact job requirements of GA.
	I would recommend that, they offer B-Tech part time instead but its not a severe problem.
	I would strongly recommend the change of title into Junior Lecturer. Furthermore I would like to see close communication and performance appraisal based on tangible aspect by department HOD's / mentor of GA.
	It's a brilliant idea. Perhaps tell students about this programme in first year, the criteria for selection & the benefits thereof.
	Maybe a clear future prospects within that department you are involved in.
	There should be a document given to all staff members outlining the job description of a GA and clarifying exactly which instructions should you follow first, of a lecture or HOD.
	Yes. I feel that they should also be treated as any other permanent staff member and be entitled to all the benefits that are available at Tech.
	I would recommend that GA's be given a chance to choose subjects (coarses) that they feel comfortable with so as to improve interest in their work.
	Rephrase 'GA'
	I think it would be better to have a well defined job description not just say 'you do what other academics are doing', selfish HOD's can use this to their advantage since some of us don't know what academics are supposed to do.
	There is always room for improvement in everything, so 'Yes'.
	I would recommend that GA's be treated as lecturers because some are as good as lecturers and sometimes better. They must be offered every support they need to develop and must not be pressured or denied chances of devt.
	To change the name GA to Junior Lecturer because of the stigma attached to it.
	That there be an official job description. Be a forum or regular meeting to assess the progress from the GA's point of view, discussion to expand ourselves and contribute accordingly.
Would you like to participate in further discussions regarding this research? No ans: 2 YES: 15 NO: 3	

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND CONTRIBUTION.

Dear
Department of

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HOD's WITH GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

As part of my Masters Degree in Education I am researching the Graduate Assistant (GA) programme at Technikon Natal. I would greatly appreciate your assistance in this matter.

I have requested your contact details in this questionnaire in order to facilitate further investigation. However, your responses will be treated with confidentiality and your identity will be withheld in any publications resulting from this study. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Your responses could assist the Technikon in improving the GA programme. Should you want to write more than the space permits, please attach additional pages, ensuring question numbering is correct.

Should you have further questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many Thanks

Roz Havenga

HOD Name:	GA Name:
Department:	Faculty:
Dates of GA contract: Started: Expected Completion:	

Please place an X in the appropriate box where necessary.

SECTION 1 - BIOGRAPHICAL

1	What hours of work / daily attendance at Technikon do you expect of your GA? - (either teaching or studying)	Mon : Wed : Fri : Other :	Tues : Thurs :		
2	How many months working experience does your GA have?	None	<12 months	12-24 months	> 24 months
3	In terms of preparation for an academic career, is your GA's working experience...	Sufficient?		Insufficient?	
4	Does your GA take the same holidays as academics?				
5	How much time per week do you expect your GA to spend on academic work at night / at weekends?				
6	What facilities are available for your GA? - Check all applicable blocks.				
	Own Desk	Own Computer	Shared Computer	No Computer Access	
	Own Bookcase	Own Office	Shared Office	Sufficient Stationery	Y N
	Own Cupboard	Own Telephone	Shared Telephone	No access to telephone	
	Welcome in Staff Tea Room		Not encouraged to use Staff Tea Room		
7	Comment on Biographical details (see Questions 1 - 6 above) :				

SECTION 2 - DEPARTMENT RELATIONSHIPS

	What is your GA's relationship with:	Very good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor
1	Yourself as HOD					
2	Other staff					
3	Students					
4	Comments on Department Relationships:					

SECTION 3 - MENTORSHIP

1	Does your GA have a Departmental Mentor?	No	Yes	Name:
2	Does your GA have a Faculty Mentor?	No	Yes	Name:
3	Discuss the mentoring process: (success / potential / problems / recommendations)			

SECTION 4 - STAFF INDUCTION

1	Has your GA attended the Academic Staff Induction Programme?	Complete	Current	Not yet Started
2	Has your GA submitted a Portfolio?	Submitted	Working on it	Not yet Started
3	What teaching methods does your GA favour? Why? (Lecture / Demonstration / Group Work / Discussion / other:)			
4	How well is OBE incorporated into your department?			
5	Has your GA undertaken a student evaluation of his/her performance?	Yes	No	
	If Yes, please comment:			
6	Have you (as HOD) obtained any informal student feedback?	Yes	No	
	If Yes, please comment:			
7	Has your GA undertaken a peer/staff evaluation of his/her performance?	Yes	No	
	If Yes, please comment:			
8	Have you (as HOD) obtained any informal peer/staff feedback?	Yes	No	
	If Yes, please comment:			

9	Indicate how competent your GA is at meeting the outcomes for the teaching portfolio		Competent	Almost competent	Not competent
	1	Designing a teaching programme			
	2	Using a wide range of teaching and learning strategies			
	3	Providing support to students in academic and pastoral matters			
	4	Using a wide range of assessment methods			
	5	Evaluating work with a range of self, peer and student monitoring			
	6	Performing effectively in teaching support and administrative matters			
	7	Developing professional and personal coping strategies			
	8	Gaining an appreciation of the particular educational concerns of your discipline			
	9	Reflecting on own personal and professional practice and making a plan for continuing professional development			
	10	Identifying and meeting departmental outcomes			
10	Comments on Staff Induction (Q1-9 above):				

SECTION 5 - DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES

1	What do you understand are the most important conditions / terms of your GA's contract?					
2	With regard to lecturing, does your GA lecture..	Alone		With Supervision		Not allowed to lecture
	With regard to lecturing, does your GA lecture... (also indicate the number of periods per week for each category)	Theory	ppw	Practicals	ppw	Tutorials ppw
	With regard to lecturing, does your GA lecture..	First years		Second Years		Third Years
	With regard to lecturing, does your GA ..	Prepare lectures		Prepare tests & other assessments		Mark tests & other assessments

3	<p>List everything you expect your GA to do in your department. Try to allocate a percentage of his/her time to each task. (Use the hours indicated in Section 1 question 1 for guidance) Check YES if you think it is part of the GA contract, and NO if you think it is not part of the GA contract.</p>	% time	YES - part of GA contract	NO - not part of GA contract
	Teaching			
	Mentoring students			
	Studying towards own qualification			
	Preparation for teaching			
	Assessment of learning			
	Administrative work			
	Supervision of Students Experiential Training			
	Other: (please specify)			
	Other: (please specify)			
4	<p>List anything your GA is NOT doing now that you think he/she SHOULD be doing. Explain briefly:</p>			
5	<p>If you checked "No - not part of GA contract" in Question 3 for anything, please explain briefly:</p>			
6	<p>What additional staff development / support factors would assist your GA to become a better academic? Check this list as ✓(received), X (not received), NA (not applicable), NN (not necessary).</p>			
	Coaching on how to deal with stress			
	More motivation and encouragement			
	Further assistance with teaching skills			
	Opportunity to gain additional industry experience			
	Coaching in academic writing skills			
	Coaching in how to deal with students			
	coaching in cultural sensitivity			
	Assistance with research skills			
	Opportunities to talk to other GA's			
	Coaching in time management skills			
	Coaching in communication skills			
	Coaching in computer skills (please specify)			
	Other (please specify)			

7	Comment on Duties and Responsibilities (Q1-6 above):

SECTION 6 - PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

1	What effect has the GA programme had on your GA as a person?		
2	What effect has the GA programme had in preparing your GA for a career as an academic?		
3	What effect has the GA programme had in preparing your GA for a career outside academia?		
4	Do you regard your GA as being more of a	lecturer	student
5	When you offered the GA position, did you see it as a route to.....	Developing an academic	Assistance in obtaining a post-graduate qualification
6	Comment on Personal Development (Q1-5 above):		

SECTION 7 - CONCLUSION

1	Has the GA contract period been enjoyable from your perspective? Briefly comment.
2	Would you like to be able to offer your GA a lecturing post in your department? Briefly comment.
3	What would you recommend to improve the concept of the GA programme?

Would you like to participate in further discussions regarding this research?

YES

NO

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND CONTRIBUTION.

SECTION 1 - BIOGRAPHICAL

1	Q1 What hours of work / daily attendance at Technikon do you expect of your GA? - (either teaching or studying)	Q5 How much time per week do you expect your GA to spend on academic work at night / at weekends?	From S5Q2		
			Th	Pr	Tu
	half week-either Mon or Wed a half day	none	-	6	6
	9:00 - 12:00, M to F except when lecturing, lectures until 15:40	Not much at this stage			
	(14) M4,W2,T4, F4 Tues off	6-10	-	12	2
	(22) M6,T6,W4,T6,F6	13	5	5	1
	(40) 8:00-16:00, M to F	Whatever it takes	2	-	2
	He work normal office/academic hours	no answer			
	(15) 9:00-1200 teaching + attend all BTech lectures	20hrs towards BTech	6	-	6
	(37.5) 8 hrs per day + 5½hrs Fri	7.5 (1½hrs M to F)			
	(35) 8:00-15:00, M to F	1hr	10	-	-
	(30) M7.5, T3, W7.5,T8, F1,S3	15hrs	-	-	12
	40hr week	± 10 if necessary	2	3	-
	(40) 8:00 - 16:00		2	6	-
	(40) 8hrs M- F +functions/meetings	5-10 hrs	2	12	-
	(42.5) 8:00 to 4:30	± 10	-	15	-
	*(40) No set times norm 7:00-15:00	2-6hrs	6	2	4
	As for academic staff	See Q1 (As for academic staff)	-	-	17
	(40) 8:00- 16:00 M to F	3hrs	5	7	-
	(40) 8:00- 16:00 M to F	BT study time only	4	3	-
	(40) 40 hr week (if Sat - wk day off)	Nil for dept work. Sat - his classes & study day	-	-	-
	(33) M7, T5, W7, T7, F7	16hrs	9	6	-
2	How many months working experience does your GA have?	None: 6	<12mths : 5	12-24 mths: 5	>24mths:4
3	In terms of preparation for an academic career, is your GA's working experience...	Sufficient: 6	Not ideal: 1	Insufficient: 12	
4	Does your GA take the same holidays as academics?			Yes: 18	No:2
6	What facilities are available for your GA?				
	Own Desk: 18	Own Computer: 10	Shared Computer: 10		
	Own Bookcase: 14	Own Office: 5	Shared Office: 10	Sufficient Stationery	Y19 N
	Own Cupboard:10½	Own Telephone:10	Shared Tel :9	No access to telephone	
	Welcome in Staff Tea Room: 17	No answer: 1		Don't have one:2	

7	Comment on Biographical details (see Questions 1 - 6 above) :	No answer: 10
	Q5. To prepare lectures, time depending on type of lecture and insight in material	
	He is making good progress with his B.Tech research and has developed more maturity as a person.	
	Tues evening 1630 - 1900 lecturing + practicals. GA fully fledged member of department.	
	GA by definition has no work experience. Preparation view staff development programme.	
	Our B.Tech's are offered on a PT basis, which means ** attends lectures in the evenings and Sat Mornings. Other academic work (ie towards the B.Tech) must be completed in the afternoons.	
	The GA has to use temporary office space in the Tea room as no other space is available.	
	*No set working hours but must be available when needed - normally 07:00 - 15:00 daily or as timetable requires.	
	GA should be treated as academic staff	
	First year ** lectures 4 periods / wk and 3 periods prac every two weeks. He is currently studying 2 BTech subjects.	
	Although he has had teaching experience, it is in a very different setting, where there has been a traditional approach to teaching with learners being passive, and younger. Also, little in way of teaching resources available.	

SECTION 2 - DEPARTMENT RELATIONSHIPS

	What is your GA's relationship with:	Very good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor
1	Yourself as HOD	14	5			
2	Other staff	12	8			
3	Students	13	6		1	
4	Comments on Department Relationships:					No answer: 8
	It depends on personalities, the current GA have no problems relating to staff and students, the previous one do not relate to staff at all but not to bad to students.					
	** has become the 5 th member of staff that will be sorely missed next year!					
	GA has blended well into the department					
	Student evaluations have indicated that he respects them which they value. The staff and I have a very good relationship with ** and he is treated as any staff member.					
	We are a small multi cultural department and have no problematic departmental relationships amongst staff of the department.					
	Temporary problem with students has been very well resolved.					
	Very early to make valued judgement					
	None					
	Well suited to the department and her students					
	He is immature and has difficulty keeping appointments and managing his time effectively					
	I think they are good, but it is not always possible to guage whether he is feeling that way. He does not talk about it comfortably.					
	Excellent					

SECTION 3 - MENTORSHIP

1	Does your GA have a Departmental Mentor?	No: 2	Yes: 19	
2	Does your GA have a Faculty Mentor?	No: 5	Yes: 11	Do not know :1 No ans : 3
3	Discuss the mentoring process:	No answer:5		
	Currently no problems. Mentor will assist with lecturs, look at briefs and monnitor lectures, marking and critts. Stricter with present GA after failures with previous GA			
	Faculty mentors (and their disciplined areas) -should be well			
	Process in its infancy in our department			
	Yes			
	GA is lecturing one class of a subject the mentor controls. She is working with him in that subject. This is proving successful as they have contact on a daily basis regarding problems he may have and providing him with feedback.			
	Mentoring is done very willingly by **- does impinge on her private time. ** is an excellent mentor.			
	Mentor is assisting GA with delivery of lessons, classroom control, etc. This has been very successful because a dedicated mentor has been used.			
	N/A			
	She approaches the departmental mentor with problems. Perhaps she could be more closely monitored but we all lead very busy lives in this dept.			
	Not enough time spent together. Recent intense 'discussions' have been very rewarding to both parties - although very time consuming for mentor (assessments, interviews, discussions, feedback sessions etc)			
	3 dept mentors - 1 for each subject			
	In terms of GA guidelines.			
	She lectures and runs her programmes under my supervision. I feel that we have a relatively good working relationship.			
	Works well.			
	No specific mentor, he has been assigned to a few. There have been some problems. We realise he needs to be attached to one person, not the HOD. Time is a problem as we are very short staffed. This will happen now. Also I have spoken to the faculty mentor, who will assist.			

SECTION 4 - STAFF INDUCTION

1	Has your GA attended the Academic Staff Induction Programme?	Complete: 9	Current: 10	Not yet Started: 2
2	Has your GA submitted a Portfolio?	Submitted	Working on it: 17	Not yet Started: 3
3	What teaching methods does your GA favour? Why?			No answer: 1
	Demonstration			
	Demonstations and Group Work			
	Demonstration, Groupwork. Practical ** tutorial discussions.			

	Lecture, demonstration, computer tutorials
	Don't know
	A mix of groupwork and discussion. Some lecturing is necessary.
	Lecture, demonstration.
	Lecturing & groupwork.
	Only does group work in tutorials
	Lecture / demonstration and then the theory is put into practice as it is very practical.
	Discussion - it lets people to open up the ideas
	'Group work' & 'self work' to start with - Now moved to 'lecture' to satisfy student needs.
	Groupwork
	Too early to comment
	As GA she is however involved in all the above
	All teaching methods are used and she is competent in most
	A wide variety of methods are used
	Lecture
	Group work
4	How well is OBE incorporated into your department? No answer: 2
	Well
	We have started but rearly (??) well in areas where he teach.
	Is being introduced currently
	Pilot dept for **. Seriously under development.
	In one subject ** excellent. Others busy.
	We have made some start but are not one of the formal "trial" depts. In some subjects lecture guides are being updated in the OBE format. Our self evaluation report was positive in this regard.
	Critical outcomes have been created for all levels of the diploma and degree programme. Not much progress to date.
	** I & II is taught largely in OBE format.
	Reasonably
	As it is quite practical in nature - There is a strong emphasis on achieving outcomes. Our study guides are written in this format.
	In practical assessments - very well. Theory needs a lot more attention.
	Well - in constant development
	Fair!
	Working on it
	Rudimentary beginnings
	In process of implementing. ** is one of the OBE pilot programmes.
	Variable - it is good in the course he is studying, we do use a variety of teaching and assessment methods based on OBE. Are implementing OBE at the moment.
	Totally

5	Has your GA undertaken a student evaluation of his/her performance?	Yes 8	No 12	No answer: 10
	Favourable comments from staff and students.			
	Was good			
	We haven't had the computerised feedback, but the additional comments provided by students were on the whole positive.			
	Not yet as GA accompanies mentor to lecture venue & has only recently begun lecturing.			
	Generally well received by students. She expects high standards. She is friendly but maintains her distance in her professional capacity.			
	1st Semester students rated him OK. 4th Semester students rated him less than OK - major problem areas - which are now being addressed. Will do another assessment in 1 months time.			
	Will be done in 2nd semester			
	Excellent evaluations received			
	Positive, ** is working on his strengths and weaknesses			
	Not that I am aware of.			
6	Have you (as HOD) obtained any informal student feedback?	Yes 13	No: 7	No answer: 7
	Positive			
	Relate well to staff and students, students relate well to him and he teaches in there level.			
	Favourable comments from staff and students.			
	Generally favourable but some BTech students had minor criticisms.			
	Highly respected by the students.			
	Students has an excellent rapport with the GA.			
	Professional in her approach. Has suitable industry knowledge for the subject taught.			
	Groups of students coming to my office to complain. Chatting in the passage to find out how things are going.			
	Few difficulties - mainly insufficient communication			
	Students have responded positively			
	Good GA			
	A number of students have complained about having him teach them. We intervened and adapted to assist in building relationships			
	Good feedback.			
7	Has your GA undertaken a peer/staff evaluation of his/her performance?	Yes 8	No: 12	No answer: 8
	Favourable comments from staff and students.			
	Mixed but mostly positive.			
	Will do			
	This is planned within the next week or so by his mentor.			
	This is done by the mentor who is of the opinion that the GA has great potential to be an above average academic.			
	We are busy with this at present			
	He has excellent ability in the eyes of the staff.			
	Shortcomings identified to be worked on - overall good.			

	Informally will be done in 2nd semester		
	Satisfactory to good		
	Ongoing feedback + one formal assessment - there are areas to be worked on		
	I initiated it, not the GA. This has happened a number of times. He is good in areas, but seems to lack insight in areas that need improvement.		
8	Have you (as HOD) obtained any informal peer/staff feedback?	Yes: 17	No 3 No answer: 2
	Personal relationship a bit strained		
	Staff feels that he do have the abilities to be a successful lecturer. He is always willing to help or assist when needed.		
	Small staff co-operation and overlap of practical subjects - create close interpersonal contact and feedback		
	Positive but negative in the beginning from one staff member		
	Positive		
	It would appear that he did struggle a little in the beginning of the year, but has improved significantly during the year.		
	Staff and students comment very highly on ** ability to lecture and to discipline the students.		
	As for No. 7		
	Only favourable comments have been received by peers.		
	A good teacher, participates in all the department does outside of normal duty. Very competent and able to take pressure.		
	Shortcomings have been pointed out, and I have made suggestions for improvement, which he is implementing.		
	Highly commended.		
	Positive		
	Most staff are happy with his performance		
	Regularly ** (<i>mentor</i>) and I speak about his progress.		
	Formally and informally - we have discussed progress and where he needs to improve. Have tried to implement strategies to assist.		
	Student reflection processes show good & mature decisions made.		

9	Indicate how competent your GA is at meeting the outcomes for the teaching portfolio	Competent	Almost competent	Not competent
	Designing a teaching programme	3	11	3
	Using a wide range of teaching and learning strategies	5	11	2
	Providing support to students in academic and pastoral matters	11	6	2
	Using a wide range of assessment methods	4	11	3
	Evaluating work with a range of self, peer & student monitoring	2	12	2
	Performing effectively in teaching support & administrative matters	9	6	3
	Developing professional and personal coping strategies	7	7	3
	Gaining an appreciation of the particular educational concerns of your discipline	6	12	
	Reflecting on own personal and professional practice and making a plan for continuing professional development	6	9	2
	Identifying and meeting departmental outcomes	8	9	
10	Comments on Staff Induction (Q1-9 above):			No answer: 9
	This years programme seems to prepare the GA better and give them a good grounding for lecturing			
	A module of teaching (practical work & theory lectures - based on departmental programme work) in the department should be included - as part of evaluation and method of guidance.			
	GA has developed skills and maturity throughout this year. Lots to learn. Staff induction 2 introductory periods left.			
	These are developmental issues & unlikely to be strongly developed yet.			
	Where ** is not yet competent it is because these skills are currently being developed.			
	A valuable exercise - too much unnecessary theory.			
	(Q9.1 not yet exposed to teaching) GA has not yet been on the staff induction programme.			
	Grandiose ideas on teaching & learning strategies which may work for the Arts are not suitable for Science. Induction presenters seem to push tutorial / group discussions as a good way of facilitating learning, but if the student knows nothing, old fashioned lecturing must precede other methods.			
	Most of these questions are not relevant yet - GA only has 1 month of experience.			
	The period under review (1 year) is not adequate as an indication for the above scoring.			
	Although not competent in these areas there has been improvement.			

SECTION 5 - DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES

1	What do you understand are the most important conditions of your GA's contract?			No answer: 9		
	Develop as future lecturer					
	To be involved in there studys and lectures and be willingly to learn through the prosses.					
	To assist groups and individuals of second language (particularly Black students) backgrounds in terms of facilitating communication; assimilation and interpetation of syllabus work, and assisting lecturing staff.					
	Complete B Tech. Help students effectively. Attend induction programs					
	Academic & lecturing development					
	That this is not an automatic entrance to a permanent position					
	That he can lecture up to 12 periods per week. That the department must provide reasonable time for his studies. That he must undergo mentoring / induction to help him develop as academic.					
	To select a good performer, guide and hone skills, encourage both personal and academic growth to hopefully take up employment as a junior lecturer within this department.					
	1. Obtain a B Tech qualification. 2. Lecturing. 3. Admin duties.					
	To be exposed to academic and academic administration activities to the extent of about 12 periods per week.					
	To gain experience lecturing and the successful completion of the person's studies.					
	To finish his M Tech within 2 years. To lecture & take pracs as academics do at about half the load of a full time staff member. To get involved in other departmental things - join the team.					
	Complete B Tech. 12 periods lecturing. 2 yrs. Finish teaching portfolio					
	Completing a B Tech & adapting to a teaching environment.					
	All the conditions, however the teaching experience needs more time					
	Teaching, lectoring(**?) (practicals), marking & progress towards her masters					
	Assist ** in preparing to become an effective lecturer					
	To facilitate learning to be a good educator by working within a department, and gaining an appropriate qualification - with a view that he will get a position if it was available.					
	To give the GA opportunities for academic and administrative growth experiences and to recognise how to use + integrate knowledge & practice with the sole objective of becoming an academic.					
	2	With regard to lecturing, does your GA lecture..	Alone: 11 +3x½	With Supervision: 5 + 3x½	Not allowed to lecture:1	
		With regard to lecturing, does your GA lecture...	Theory: 14	Practicals: 14	Tutorials: 11	
		With regard to lecturing, does your GA lecture..	First years:18	Second Years: 9	3rd Yr: 2	4th yr: 1
		With regard to lecturing, does your GA ..	Prepare lectures: 16	Prepare test/ other assessments: 12	Mark tests & other assessments: 14	

3	List everything you expect your GA to do in your department. Try to allocate a percentage of his/her time to each task. (Use the hours indicated in Section 1 question 1 for guidance) Check YES if you think it is part of the GA contract, and NO if you think it is not part of the GA contract.	YES - part of GA contract	NO - not part of GA contract
	Teaching	20	
	Mentoring students	19	
	Studying towards own qualification	18	
	Preparation for teaching	18	1
	Assessment of learning	15	
	Administrative work	16	1
	Supervision of Students Experiential Training	5	7
	Other: (please specify) What ever else it takes, Diverse, Involvement in extracurricular departmental activities, **, Projects, seminar evening, industrial liaison meetings, training, general assist to lecturers, counseling: (Black students -in relation to their coursework)	7	
4	List anything your GA is NOT doing now that you think he/she SHOULD be doing. No answer: 6 Two responses = N/A / Two responses = None		
	This section (Q3) is too complex to do quickly. (No more questions answered.)		
	It is difficult to allocate periods in Q2 and % in Q3 he had lectures this year in 3 areas and this involved th, prac + tuts. Each term a nother subject.		
	The GA is not lecturing or assessing at the moment. This will be done in the 2nd year of contract.		
	Could perhaps do some tutoring of first years		
	Coming to tea - that's where the spirit is built! He knows he is welcome, has paid his subs, but only rarely comes to tea. I don't want to instruct him to!		
	Not enough application to own studies.		
	No Comment		
	Working harder on ** Masters		
	More lecturing - will increase next year once he has had one year supervised experience		
	Will start supervising ET. Spending more time on work in department and showing more initiative in becoming involved.		
5	If you checked "No - not part of GA contract" in Question 3 for anything, explain: No answer: 12		
	Admin work - no need / Exp. Training - not applicable.		
	No need to do it (**experiential)		
	Our students do not do formal experiential training and what is done is not done at the 1st year level.		
	There are other more experienced people fulfilling this position.(Ref - experiential)		
	N/A		
	She lecturers from previously prepared notes. Experiential training is not her job.		
	Own time		

6	What additional staff development / support factors would assist your GA to become a better academic? ^{1 2 3}	Additional comment	✓	X	N A	N N
	Coaching on how to deal with stress	✓.	6	5		3
	More motivation and encouragement		10	1		2
	Further assistance with teaching skills	Yes. ✓. ✓	10	3		
	Opportunity to gain additional industry experience	Yes. ✓. ✓✓. Once completed.	5	6	1	1
	Coaching in academic writing skills	Yes. ✓. ✓.	5	3	1	2
	Coaching in how to deal with students	Yes. ✓. ✓.	9	2		1
	Coaching in cultural sensitivity	Yes. ✓.	4	4		3
	Assistance with research skills	Yes. ✓.	9	5		
	Opportunities to talk to other GA's	Yes. Through induction programme	8	2		2
	Coaching in time management skills	✓✓.*. ✓✓. ✓.	8	3	1	2
	Coaching in communication skills	✓. ✓✓. ✓	10	2	1	1
	Coaching in computer skills (Discipline software)	✓.	12			2
	Other: Assistance with setting priorities (does link with Time Management.)					
7	Comment on Duties and Responsibilities (Q1-6 above):					No answer: 13
	Being in his first year of the programme, one gave him the opportunity to be exposed to different subjects, to gain a wider experience and to ?? with ?? at the integration of the subjects.					
	GA predominantly lectured / assisted with first years - and second years in some areas. He also supervised tests and site visits; seminars etc.					
	Tests and lecture notes often already done by another. Lectures only servicing of other departments. Uses demonstration lectures - practicals are on computers (also tutorials).					
	** has more the adequately fulfilled his duties and responsibilities, as expected of him by the dept.					
	Our GA is very competent and has most of the skills referred to.					
	Nil					

¹ "I phoned but you were not in, this question is contradictory, you ask additional, but then answer that you have received it. It can't be additional if they have done it, or am I wrong? I think all of this should be covered in the programmes." *This response indicates the confusion of this question. See issues of Reliability & Validity.*

² Don't know if he has received but does need

³ All Applicable.

SECTION 6 - PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

1	What effect has the GA programme had on your GA as a person?	No answer: 1
	Helps to develop him into a lecturer that can deal with the everyday crises of tutoring	
	Transformed a staff/student relationship to a more academic/informal colleague basis.	
	She has matured and grown in self-confidence, teaching ability and administrative skills.	
	Maturity and responsibility.	
	He became a well integrated staff member.	
	Has developed him academically, and made him more confident in application of learned theory.	
	Very stimulating, gained respect from the staff and the students.	
	More mature, ability to teach, more academically competent - decision to make academics a career.	
	Motivation to complete a B Tech.	
	She has matured during her 2yr period and it has been a valuable learning experience.	
	N/A	
	Given him a lot more confidence. Made him proud of his "job", office, & standing in the community.	
	Matured and grown	
	Too early to comment	
	Created a sense of self confidence and motivation. However this has to be sustained. See S6Q2.	
	I think she has grown with the programme.	
	I believe it has been a growth experience for ** academically and personally	
	First GA was excellent. The GA programme assisted her enormously. The second one has not been affected as much.	
	Incredible growth.	
2	What effect has the GA programme had in preparing your GA for a career as an academic?	
	Good grounding	
	Good introduction and hands on experience.	
	Definitely successful.	
	Too soon to tell but has potential.	
	He knows now what an academic has to do.	
	Introduced him to the career as an alternative, where otherwise it may not have been considered.	
	Exposed to the responsibilities of lecturing and assessment.	
	Experience of on the job training.	
	Has created the opportunity to be exposed to the nature of the job as an academic.	
	She has expressed the desire to get back to industry to gain more experience which later on can be used as a resource.	
	N/A	
	Very good so far. Experience will do the rest.	
	Excellent grounding but needs industry exp.	
	Created expectations! However will the institution be able to meet them with a job offer?	
	An excellent one.	

	Good		
	Has assisted, but still more room for improvement.		
	Good		
3	What effect has the GA programme had in preparing your GA for a career outside academia?		
	Help to develop his self image		
	Realistic projects and interaction with industry.		
	For user support in computers or groupwork.		
	None		
	Could earn a bigger salary in industry.		
	Improved confidence in being able to apply learned theory.		
	Enjoyed academia - not interested in any other field.		
	Except for a B Tech qualification, not very much.		
	None.		
	She has been involved in training and in the ** industry there is a great need for this.		
	N/A		
	Not had an effect?		
	More mature and work-wise		
	Unknown		
	Very little I would suggest		
	Good - limited since largely academic/ lecturing duties.		
	Very good - he has become a good ** practitioner.		
	Limited!		
4	Do you regard your GA as being more of a ...	lecturer: 13 and 3x½	student:2 and 3x½
5	When you offered the GA position, did you see it as a route to.....	Developing an academic: 11 + 6x½	Assistance in obtaining a post-graduate qualification:2 + 6x½
6	Comment on Personal Development (Q1-5 above):		
	It is rewarding to see a lecturer developing. (the right person have to be GA, this is difficult to identify, you don't always make the right choice of person.		
	Over and above obtaining a post-grad. Qualification - after completion individual candidates should be invited - on merit -to complete a 1 year contract / Junior Lectureship.		
	GA learnt a great deal.		
	I believe ** has gained confidence. His written and verbal communication skills have also improved. Which will serve him well however he chooses to further his career.		
	** has grown in stature this year by successfully coping with a variety of academic and administrative matters.		
	The GA would like to become a lecturer and sees this as an opportunity to achieve this ambition.		
	Satisfactory		
	He needs to develop a better understanding of how to relate to peers (academic staff) and students. He appears to be aloof - but it is likely to be a cultural problem. He comes from a deep rural area and is very highly regarded in his community and accorded high status.		

SECTION 7 - CONCLUSION

1	Has the GA contract period been enjoyable from your perspective? Briefly comment. No answer:2
	Yes, it depends on the GA, if they respond to the effort you put into them.
	Our GA greatly assisted with communication and transfer of knowledge - especially with our Black students. As an alumni of our dept. the GA embodied its ideal and goals.
	Yes, except for certain difficult students and an overcritical staff member.
	Yes.
	Yes, well integrated student.
	Yes, the department receives valuable assistance, the GA has definitely benefited, and hopefully would now consider a career as an academic.
	Yes, ** has contributed very positively to both staff and students alike.
	Yes - this graduate assistant has been an asset to this dept.
	Yes, the GA has a pleasant attitude towards all that he does and is also very keen and willing to take on any task.
	Yes
	Yes, but time consuming & nerve-wracking at times.
	Yes - all parties have benefitted & developed.
	Yes - thus far
	"Enjoyable?" We have tried to create an environment whereby the GA feels she is part of the team.
	Yes - save for the fact that her studies have been somewhat neglected.
	Yes.
	The first GA was excellent. This one has had some enjoyable periods - he has started a project in the community with some students - and is well skilled here. But other aspects have been a strain.
	Yes! My left and right hand. Being the only academic on my staff + HOD + secretary at times I could not have run the dept without my GA.
2	Would you like to be able to offer your GA a lecturing post in your department? No answer: 1
	Yes, the current person is developing into a worthwhile lecturer. The previous one I have my doubts.
	Definitely! He is familiar with staff, students and running of academic programme and a 'known' entity.
	Yes, she performs a very useful function especially to ** students (and would in the future)
	Yes.
	Yes. He fits in very well and should he want to stay - no problem.
	I would most definitely. However as he has majored in ** he would be better off careerwise in one of those depts.
	Yes. She now has an idea of procedures and standards expected by this department.
	Yes - when one becomes available.
	Yes. He would be an asset to the department.
	Once she has gained more experience in industry yes, but it also depends on the subjects to be lectured
	N/A
	Cannot answer yet.
	Not yet - insufficient industry experience would be a limiting factor in her academic development.
	Yes - if a vacancy is available.

	No comment			
	Yes - very much			
	Yes - it would be a pity to lose him if he continues to do a good job.			
	No. I do not believe he would fit in properly at this stage. The other staff do not trust him to do academic duties. However I believe he could improve with intensive mentoring.			
	Yes!			
3	What would you recommend to improve the concept of the GA programme? No answer: 5			
	At this stage I support the programme, it seem to be a good overall programme covering a wide range of activities.			
	Based on merit - the GA could be offered a one year (2) Contract lectureship, after his qualification year - to consolidate.			
	More planning at departmental level to make GA's time pleasant and productive.			
	More GA's.			
	I believe there needs to be some way of incorporating business experience into the program.			
	Where the GA job description clarifies the duties to academics as compared to assisting the secretarial staff			
	Currently there is a reasonable demand from students to become a GA in this dept. Selection and placement could become problematic.			
	For appointments to be made in the previous year so at the start of an academic year - everything is in place - otherwise very disruptive.			
	I'm not really familiar with the GA programme. (**mentor not HOD)			
	Extend it to all races.			
	Telling GA's what's happening afterwards as expectations have been created.			
	I think GA's should at least be studying towards a Masters. BTech is not qualified enough to teach others after 3 years learning.			
	Careful selection - we used special funds to pay psychologist to help us select the best candidate. Tech should pay for this. It works very well.			
	More contact with HOD re (**teaching) portfolio and his progress on the (**teaching) programme. Good development programme but will not ensure that all GA's would be suitable for employment.			
	Yes!			
Would you like to participate in further discussions regarding this research?		No ans: 2	YES:15	NO: 3

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND CONTRIBUTION.

Dear
Department of

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PAST GRADUATE ASSISTANTS EMPLOYED BY TN

As part of my Masters Degree in Education I am researching the Graduate Assistant (GA) programme at Technikon Natal. I would greatly appreciate your assistance in this matter.

I have requested your contact details in this questionnaire in order to facilitate further investigation. However, your responses will be treated with confidentiality and your identity will be withheld in any publications resulting from this study. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Your responses could assist the Technikon in improving the GA programme. Should you want to write more than the space permits, please attach additional pages, ensuring question numbering is correct.

Should you have further questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many Thanks

Roz Havenga

Name:	Faculty:
Department:	
Qualification gained during GA post:	Complete? Yes / No
Dates of GA contract: Started:	Completed:

Please place an X in the appropriate box where necessary.

SECTION 1 - BIOGRAPHICAL

1	How many months of work experience in an industry related to your field of study have you gained?	None	<12 months	12-24 months	> 24 months
2	In terms of preparation for an academic career, was your working experience...	Sufficient?		Insufficient?	
3	What facilities are available for you? - Check all applicable blocks.				
	Own Desk	Own Computer	Shared Computer	No Computer Access	
	Own Bookcase	Own Office	Shared Office	Sufficient Stationery	Y N
	Own Cupboard	Own Telephone	Shared Telephone	No access to telephone	
4	Do you feel completely integrated with the other staff members in your department? Yes / No				
5	Comment on Biographical details (see Questions 1 - 4 above) :				

SECTION 2 - DEPARTMENT RELATIONSHIPS

	What is your relationship with:	Very good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor
1	HOD					
2	Other staff					
3	Students					
4	Comments on Department Relationships:					

SECTION 3 - MENTORSHIP

1	Do you have a Departmental Mentor?	No	Yes	Name:
2	Do you have a Faculty Mentor?	No	Yes	Name:
3	Discuss the mentoring process: (success / potential / problems / recommendations)			

SECTION 4 - STAFF INDUCTION

1	Have you attended the Academic Staff Induction Programme?	Complete	Current	Not yet Started
2	Have you submitted a Portfolio?	Submitted	Working on it	Not yet Started
3	What was the most beneficial part of the induction process?			
4	What was the least beneficial part of the induction process?			
5	Did the orientation week assist you to identify with the Technikon?			
6	What did you learn about Quality Assurance in teaching?			
7	What teaching methods do you favour? Why? (Lecture / Demonstration / Group Work / Discussion / other:)			
8	What type of student performance assessment methods do you favour? Why?			
9	What do you understand about OBE:			
10	How well is OBE incorporated into your department?			

11	Have you undertaken a student evaluation of your performance?		Yes	No	
	If Yes, please comment:				
12	Have you obtained any informal student feedback?		Yes	No	
	If Yes, please comment:				
13	Have you undertaken a peer/staff evaluation of your performance?		Yes	No	
	If Yes, please comment:				
14	Have you obtained any informal peer/staff feedback?		Yes	No	
	If Yes, please comment:				
15	What do you think are the greatest rewards for an academic?				
16	What do you think are the greatest problems facing an academic?				
17	Indicate how competent you are at meeting the outcomes for the teaching portfolio		Competent	Almost competent	Not competent
	1	Designing a teaching programme			
	2	Using a wide range of teaching and learning strategies			
	3	Providing support to students in academic and pastoral matters			
	4	Using a wide range of assessment methods			
	5	Evaluating work with a range of self, peer and student monitoring			
	6	Performing effectively in teaching support and administrative matters			
	7	Developing professional and personal coping strategies			
	8	Gaining an appreciation of the particular educational concerns of your discipline			
	9	Reflecting on own personal and professional practice and making a plan for continuing professional development			
	10	Identifying and meeting departmental outcomes			
18	Comments on Staff Induction (Q1-17 above):				

SECTION 5 - DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES

1	What do you understand are the most important conditions / terms of your position?						
2	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture..	Alone		With Supervision		Not allowed to lecture	
	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture... (also indicate the number of periods per week for each category)	Theory	ppw	Practicals	ppw	Tutorials	ppw
	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture..	First years		Second Years		Third Years	
	With regard to lecturing, do you ...	Prepare lectures		Prepare tests & other assessments		Mark tests & other assessments	
3	List everything you are expected to do in your department. Try to allocate the number of hours per week which you spend on each task.						
	Teaching						
	Mentoring students						
	Studying towards own qualification						
	Preparation for teaching						
	Assessment of learning						
	Administrative work						
	Supervision of Students Experiential Training						
	Other: (please specify)						
	Other: (please specify)						
	4	List anything you are NOT doing now that you think you SHOULD be doing. Explain briefly:					
5	List anything you ARE doing now that you think you SHOULD NOT be doing. Explain briefly:						
6	What additional staff development / support factors would assist you to become a better academic? Check this list as ✓(received), X (not received), NA (not applicable), NN (not necessary).						
	Coaching on how to deal with stress						
	More motivation and encouragement						
	Further assistance with teaching skills						
	Opportunity to gain additional industry experience						

	Coaching in academic writing skills	
	Coaching in how to deal with students	
	Coaching in cultural sensitivity	
	Assistance with research skills	
	Opportunities to talk to other GA's	
	Coaching in time management skills	
	Coaching in communication skills	
	Coaching in computer skills (please specify)	
7	Comment on Duties and Responsibilities (Q1-6 above):	

SECTION 6 - PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

1	What effect did the GA programme have on you as a person?		
2	What effect did the GA programme have in preparing you for a career as an academic?		
3	What effect did the GA programme have in preparing you for a career outside academia?		
4	When you accepted the GA position, did you see it as a route to.....	becoming an academic	obtaining a post-graduate qualification
5	Was your GA contract enjoyable? Briefly comment.		
6	Would you recommend others to follow the GA route? Why?		
7	What would you recommend to improve the concept of the GA programme?		

Would you like to participate in further discussions regarding this research?

YES

NO

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND CONTRIBUTION.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PASTGAs EMPLOYED BY TN
(** indicates information deleted which could identify respondent)

Qualification gained during GA post:	NHD: 1 Complete	BTech: 1 Incomplete
---	-----------------	---------------------

SECTION 1 - BIOGRAPHICAL

1	How many months of work experience in an industry related to your field of study have you gained?	<12mths: 1	12-24mths:1
2	In terms of preparation for an academic career, was your working experience...	Sufficient: 2	
3	What facilities are available for you?		
	Own Desk: 1	Own Office:1	No response to Office or Desk: 1
	Own Bookcase: 1	Own Computer:1	No Computer Access: 1
	Own Cupboard: 2	Own Telephone:1	Shared Telephone: 1
4	Do you feel completely integrated with the other staff members in your department?	Y: 2	
5	Comment on Biographical details (see Questions 1 - 4 above) :		
	<p>In 1996 I was in the industry and working as a **, and working hand in hand with SABS. I started at Natal Technikon as a Graduate Assistant on **1997. I had to do the bridging course because I didn't have **. I also attended teaching Induction course. I worked with ** in ** for that whole year. The following year (1998) I started my B.Tech degree. I was given a group to take for ** under the supervision of **. I also worked with ** in **. In 1999 while I was still doing my B.Tech I was asked to take first years for ** because of the shortage of staff.</p> <p>Industrial experience is far more than 24 months. I wonder whether that is still considered because people with no industrial experience are enjoying benefits which I think only lecturers with relevant experience would be entitled to. For (4) I've never understood the politics of my department so is yes & no.</p>		

SECTION 2 - DEPARTMENT RELATIONSHIPS

	What is your relationship with:	Very good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor
1	HOD	1	1			
2	Other staff	1	1			
3	Students	1	1			
4	Comments on Department Relationships:					
	On my point of view the relationship is good and they accept me as the staff member.					
	The relationships are not very good. Everything I've done in relations to lecture guide, non has even bothered to check and approve. The subject that I lecture is new and it has been so difficult for me.					

SECTION 3 - MENTORSHIP

1	Do you have a Departmental Mentor?	No: 1	Yes: 1
2	Do you have a Faculty Mentor?	Yes - Incorrect:1	Yes - Correct:1
3	Discuss the mentoring process: (success / potential / problems / recommendations)		
	She helped me through the whole period of GA and she was a good mentor. Our relationship was excellent and even now. She also helped me to build my confidence.		
	O.B.E. has not been well understood and was not that easy to apply in department, non of lecturers have clear understanding I seemed to be something of my own. Students are not totally accepting the way I lecture to them. I was totally incompetent and too critical of their work.		

SECTION 4 - STAFF INDUCTION

1	Have you attended the Academic Staff Induction Programme?	Complete:2	
2	Have you submitted a Portfolio?	Submitted:1	Working on it:1
3	What was the most beneficial part of the induction process?		
	To know how to deliver the lectur and build a good relationship with the students.		
	The assessment of student learning.		
4	What was the least beneficial part of the induction process?		No Answer = 1
	None		
5	Did the orientation week assist you to identify with the Technikon?		Yes = 2
6	What did you learn about Quality Assurance in teaching?		
	Continual assessment and feedback as we go along.		
7	What teaching methods do you favour? Why?		
	Demonstration and discussion		
	Groupwork, Discussion. These two involve everybody students themselves bring up points through the guidance of the facilitator.		
8	What type of student performance assessment methods do you favour? Why?		
	To give them a test after each and every section to find out if they're understand the section well.		
	Norm-referenced assessment. It reveals useful information which benefit both student and lecturer and usable to future studies and work.		
9	What do you understand about OBE:		
	It is about teaching students what they gonna need after their academic period and make sure that they can apply that knowledge not just study and pass without any understanding.		
10	How well is OBE incorporated into your department?		
	Very well. Our HOD is trying by all means to let us apply it.		
11	Have you undertaken a student evaluation of your performance?		Yes: 2
	I usually ask them if they understand me and ask them to tell me if they've got any problem about me		
	Students were not really following because I always wanted them to contribute.		

12	Have you obtained any informal student feedback?	Yes: 2		
	They will sometimes come to me individually tell me about my performance.			
	They said I should give them notes and not keep wanting group discussions.			
13	Have you undertaken a peer/staff evaluation of your performance?	Yes: 2		
	I let them know how I teach and if I'm doing the write thing.			
	He simply said its fine because I involved students before writing notes (OHP slides)			
14	Have you obtained any informal peer/staff feedback?	Yes: 1	No: 1	
	They help me to improve my teaching skills.			
15	What do you think are the greatest rewards for an academic?			
	Successful maturing talents and seeing your product challenging outside life with confidence.			
16	What do you think are the greatest problems facing an academic?			
	Financial problems.			
	Cultural diversity which brings different responses and attitudes. Students & public expectations			
17	Indicate how competent you are at meeting the outcomes for the teaching portfolio	Competent	Almost competent	Not competent
	Designing a teaching programme		2	
	Using a wide range of teaching and learning strategies	1	1	
	Providing support to students in academic and pastoral matters	2		
	Using a wide range of assessment methods	1		
	Evaluating work with a range of self, peer and student monitoring	1	1	
	Performing effectively in teaching support and administrative matters	1	1	
	Developing professional & personal coping strategies	1	1	
	Gaining an appreciation of the particular educational concerns of your discipline	1		1
	Reflecting on own personal & professional practice & making a plan for continuing professional development	1		1
	Identifying and meeting departmental outcomes	2		
18	Comments on Staff Induction (Q1-17 above):		No Comments: 2	

SECTION 5 - DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES

1	What do you understand are the most important conditions / terms of your position?		
	That if the post is available by the end of my GA period I will get it and I should work for them for the number of years I spent with them as a GA otherwise I have to pay them back the tuition fee.		
2	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture..	Alone: 1	With Supervision:1

	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture... (indicate ppw)	Theory: 0 / 6	Practicals:12 / 0	Tutorials: 0 / 3
	With regard to lecturing, do you lecture..	First years:2	Second Years:1	
	With regard to lecturing, do you ...	Prepare lectures: 2	Prepare test/ other assessments:2	Mark tests / other assessments: 2
3	List everything you are expected to do in your department. Allocate hours per week on each task.			
	Teaching	8hrs	3hrs	
	Mentoring students		3+hrs	
	Studying towards own qualification	week hrs minus 8 hrs.	After Hours	
	Preparation for teaching		3-6hrs	
	Assessment of learning		6hrs not every week	
	Administrative work	None	6hrs not every week	
	Supervision of Students Experiential Training	None	Students finishing assignments After Hours	
	Other: (please specify).	None		
4	List anything you are NOT doing now that you think you SHOULD be doing.			None = 1 N/A = 1
5	List anything you ARE doing now that you think you SHOULD NOT be doing.			None = 1 N/A = 1
6	What additional staff development / support factors would assist you to become a better academic? Check this list as ✓(received), X (not received), NA (not applicable), NN (not necessary).			
	Coaching on how to deal with stress	X	X	
	More motivation and encouragement	✓	X	
	Further assistance with teaching skills	✓		
	Opportunity to gain additional industry experience -	NN	Just applied	
	Coaching in academic writing skills	NA	X	
	Coaching in how to deal with students	✓	X	
	Coaching in cultural sensitivity	X	X	
	Assistance with research skills	X	✓	
	Opportunities to talk to other GA's	✓	X	
	Coaching in time management skills	✓	X	
	Coaching in communication skills	✓	X	
	Coaching in computer skills (please specify)	X	X	
7	Comment on Duties and Responsibilities (Q1-6 above):			
	They letting me do what I have to do and the working hours were fine.			
	There is more than one's job descriptions. Periods allocation not transparent / well understood. Staying after hours not recognised.			

SECTION 6 - PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

1	What effect did the GA programme have on you as a person?		
	Have a chance to build my confidence and helped me to continue with my studies.		
	It changed my attitude and perspective. I developed a communal type of culture.		
2	What effect did the GA programme have in preparing you for a career as an academic?		
	Build my confidence and be able to build a good relationship and communicate with other people.		
	Self discovery and a new position in the society. after completing my NHDip. motivated.		
3	What effect did the GA programme have in preparing you for a career outside academia?		
	When doing the research you find out thing you didn't know.		
	Confidence and credibility. Running / organising workshops for street ** (**)		
4	When you accepted the GA position, did you see it as a route to.....	becoming an academic: 1	obtaining a post-graduate qualification: 1
5	Was your GA contract enjoyable? Briefly comment.		Yes = 1
	Not in the sense that it was a new thing none knew what and how to perform duties. Other colleges were not at ease.		
6	Would you recommend others to follow the GA route? Why?		
	Yes, you work with the staff you know and understand better. As a graduate of Natal Tech, you also understand the teaching method better.		
	Yes, a GA is a role model to students especially 2nd language students but one should have love for people. Opportunity - Post G qualification.		
7	What would you recommend to improve the concept of the GA programme?		None = 1
	Depending on industrial experience one has, GA should be more of a tutor and be with students all the time sharing experiences with them. Giving them insight and motivation (not at contact time only)		

Would you like to participate in further discussions regarding this research?	YES: 2
---	--------

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND CONTRIBUTION.

**OPINIONS ON THE GRADUATE ASSISTANT SCHOLARSHIP
SURVEY - MANAGEMENT AT TECHNIKON NATAL**

As part of my Masters Degree in Education I am researching the Graduate Assistant (GA) programme at Technikon Natal. I would greatly appreciate your assistance in this matter.

I have requested your designation in this survey in order to facilitate collection of your response. However, your responses will be treated with confidentiality and your identity will be withheld from the written study.

I have sent detailed questionnaires to all current GA's and their respective heads of departments. This one page survey has been designed to be quick and hopefully easy for you to complete as I know how valuable your time is. Your responses however are extremely important to the study I am conducting.

So PLEASE, could you complete and return the survey to me by Friday 3 November 2000?

Should you have further questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many Thanks

Roz Havenga
☎Extension - 2725
October 2000

Please indicate your designation:

Principal		Vice - Principal Academic	
Dean: Arts	Dean: Commerce	Dean: Eng. & Science	Dean: Health
Dean: Planning	Dean: Adult Ed	HR Department	AQU: Staff Dev
Other Interested Party - (please state designation)			

OVERVIEW

1	In your view, what is the purpose / vision behind the GA programme?
2	What are the most important conditions / terms of the GA contract?
3	What do you think about the way in which GA appraisal is conducted in Technikon Natal / your faculty?
4	What do you think about the way in which GA issues are communicated (up & down line management structure)?

ISSUES

1	Do you regard the GA as being more of aLecturer	...Student
2	Do you see the GA position as	...developing a pool of academic experience	...providing opportunity for students to obtain post-grad qualifications
			...(other)
3	How many hours of departmental work per week would you expect of the GA?		
4	How many hours of study per week would you expect of the GA?		
5	What percentage of departmental time (given in question 3 above) should be allocated to:		
	Teaching :	Mentoring students :	
	Administration :	Other (list) :	
6	Should competency in English be a prerequisite criteria for a GA?	Yes	No
7	Should working experience be a prerequisite criteria for a GA?	Yes	No

GENERAL

1	Are you aware of other GA programmes?	Nationally?	Internationally?
2	In your opinion, is the GA programme worth the investment / cost?	Yes	No
			Unsure
3	Do you have any recommendations regarding improving the programme / points to be considered?		

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND CONTRIBUTION

OVERVIEW

1	In your view, what is the purpose / vision behind the GA programme?
	Develop young academics, especially Black Academics.
	Equity - providing a pool of potential black teaching staff for Technikon Natal
	To develop a cohort of young African academics in order to correct equity imbalance.
	To help meet equity profile required.
	To provide a pool of suitably experienced African graduates for future employment as lecturing staff
	To fast track prospective lectures from the targeted groups in order to address equity considerations.
	Transformation and affirmative action
	To fast track the development of academics and educators to meet the equity goals of the institution. To provide a cost effective form of person-power.
2	What are the most important conditions / terms of the GA contract?
	(1) Must study towards a qualification - be it B.Tech or M.Tech (2) Do a bit of teaching / tuts etc. (3) Perform at a satisfactory level
	Good lecturing potential of black (preferably African) persons
	Completion of the qualification. Fulfilment of induction requirements and teaching duties.
	Scholarly achievements & measuring of teaching potential.
	Successful academic record coupled with successful introduction to 'teaching' environment
	That the student completes his/her research while at the same time obtaining lecturing experience.
	Scholarship linked to achievement of qualification as basis for future employment.
	In my opinion the most important condition is that the GA achieves his/her educational goals.
3	What do you think about the way in which GA appraisal is conducted in Technikon Natal / your faculty?
	Unable to comment
	Trust it is OK (via Deans)
	I think there should be more communication between AQU and HODs re responsibilities.
	Acceptable - must be done at departmental level.
	Inadequate & uncoordinated - but we're trying!
	Adequate, but should be formalised since some departments are more thorough than others.
	Depends entirely on HOD dedication to the appraisal process/principles.

	Appraisal is mainly conducted for summative bureaucratic purposes and is not approached as an ongoing developmental exercise. GA's are evaluated on their educational performance, departmental activities and teaching performance against standards that are not specifically designed for teaching assistants. ie: Educational performance is expected to be that of a full-time student. Departmental activities are expected to be that of a full-time staff member and teaching performance is expected to include the range and extent of planning, implementing and evaluating of a course, expected of an experienced educator. This is unfair particularly where it takes place in an unsupportive context. I believe our GA's are extremely talented, ambitious (why else would they take the post) with great potential. They tend to burn-out as quickly as new staff members because a) they are generally not mentored. b) the goal posts that they are working towards constantly move and c) institutional reward systems are weak. (ie there is no guarantee of a post if they achieve the nebulous and undefined goals expected of them).
4	What do you think about the way in which GA issues are communicated (up & down line management structure)?
	Trust it is OK (via Deans)
	As per 3 above there needs to be greater clarity about who is responsible for what. ie communication needs improving.
	Has worked well in the faculty.
	Generally adequate
	Adequate. The HOD is the key person, so the quality depends on the HOD's approach.
	They aren't!
	Very weak. As in (3) expectations are unclear and many support staff (including me) are unclear about what each HOD expects from each GA and vice versa.

ISSUES

1	Do you regard the GA as being more of a Lecturer or Student	Lecturer: 3	Student: 3		Other: 1		No Answer: 1		
2	Do you see the GA position as developing a pool of academic experience or providing opportunity for students to obtain post-grad qualifications. Can be both.	Pool of experience: 6		Post Grad: 2. Yes & potential for a career in academia to be assessed.			No Answer: 2		
3	How many hours of departmental work per week would you expect of the GA?	About 30%	10	8	20hrs min	+20	10	12p	8
4	How many hours of study per week would you expect of the GA?	The remainder [70%]							
		lots (>20hrs)							
		32 hrs							
		20 Hrs min							
		± 20 hrs							
		Balance of week							
		10 hrs							
		BTech (120credits)-25 MTech (240 credits) -50 This assumes the principle of notional hours is viable and a 26 week academic year							

5	What percentage of departmental time (given in question 3 above) should be allocated to:		
	Teaching	15%	
		70%	
		80	
		80% 16p max	
		50%	
		As per discretion of dept but must include teaching & administration	
		8 p	
		BTech- None MTech-1hr+only in speciality	
	Mentoring	10%	
		20%	
		20%	
		15-20%	
		15-20% (4)	
		30%	
		2p	
		BTech-4 MTech-0	
	Administration	5%	
		10%	
		0	
		5-10%	
		10%	
		As per discretion of dept but must include teaching & administration	
		2p	
		BTech-2hrs Filing etc MTech-4hrs Teach prep	
	Other	10% Misc-eg marketing	
		BTech-2 lab prep MTech-2 assessment	
6	Should competency in English be a prerequisite criteria for a GA?		Yes: 8 No: 0
7	Should working experience be a prerequisite criteria for a GA?		1 = Yes Definately!! No: 7

GENERAL

1	Are you aware of other GA programmes?	Nationally	Yes: 2	No: 6
		Internationally	Yes: 3	No: 5
2	In your opinion, is the GA programme worth the investment / cost?		Yes: 7	Unsure: 1
3	Do you have any recommendations regarding improving the programme / points to be considered?			
	Such students need to be properly mentored themselves to succeed in becoming good academics. A detailed development plan should be drawn up.			
	* (with ref to Issues: Q7 - Work Exp) Not for GA but yes if GA vies for full lecturing position.			
	For <u>this</u> faculty it could be enhanced by facilitating suitable industry experience.			
	A Learnership based on the GA principles is being developed at the moment via the ETDP Seta.			
	Clearer criteria for all parties to the contract. A quality assurance system to check that GA's aren't abused. Active mentoring to assist in the development of management skills.			

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND CONTRIBUTION